Section II: Part A—Document-Based Questions

Suggested writing time—45 minutes
Percent of Section II score—45%

Directions: The following question is based on the accompanying Documents 1 through 10. (Some of the documents have been edited for the purpose of this exercise.) This question is designed to test your ability to work with historical documents. As you analyze the documents, take into account both the sources of the documents and the authors’ points of view. Write an essay on the following topic that integrates your analysis of the documents. Do not simply summarize the documents individually. You may refer to relevant historical facts and developments not mentioned in the documents.

1. Discuss and analyze the causes of the New Imperialism.

   **Historical Background:** By the early part of the nineteenth century, it appeared that the countries of Europe had lost interest in building overseas empires. However, the last third of the nineteenth century saw a new scramble for colonies. Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and Portugal engaged in a race to annex the undeveloped areas of the world. By 1914, one-third of the world’s people were under colonial control, with the countries of Europe holding the lion’s share.

**Document 1**

All great nations in the fullness of their strength have desired to set their mark upon barbarian lands. All over the globe today we see the peoples of Europe creating a mighty aristocracy of the white races. Those who take no share in this great rivalry will play a pitiable part in time to come. . . . It is a sound and normal trait in a civilized nation to avert the existing dangers of over-population by colonization on a large scale. This puts no check upon nature, and . . . augments the national strength of the mother country at the same time.


**Document 2**

No one in France . . . doubts the benefits of colonization and the advantages which it offers both to the country which undertakes it and to that which receives it. Everyone agrees that colonies offer markets for raw materials, the means of production, the products lacking to the mother-country; that they open markets to all the commerce and all the industries of an old country, by the wants, by the new needs of the people with whom they are in relation. . . .


**Document 3**

Take up the White Man’s burden —
   Send forth the best ye breed —
Go bind your sons to exile
   To serve your captives’ need;
To wait in heavy harness
   On fluttered folk and wild —
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
   Half devil and half child.

Document 4

In the area of economics, I am placing before you . . . the need for outlets. Why? Because next door Germany is setting up trade barriers; because across the ocean the United States of America have become protectionists . . .; because not only are those great markets shrinking . . . but these great states are beginning to pour into our own markets products not seen there before. . . . We must say openly that indeed the higher races have a right over the lower races. . . . They have the duty to civilize the inferior races . . . I say that French colonial policy, the policy of colonial expansion . . . was inspired by the fact that a navy such as ours cannot do without safe harbors, defenses, supply centers on the high seas . . . At present, as you know, a warship . . . cannot carry more than two weeks’ supply of coal. . . . Hence the need to have places of supply, shelters, ports for defense and provisioning . . .


Document 5

We . . . must recognize that in order that we may have more employment to give we must create more demand. Give me the demand for more goods and then I will undertake to give plenty of employment in making the goods; and the only thing, in my opinion, that the government can do in order to meet this great difficulty . . ., is so to arrange its policy that . . . new markets shall be created, and that old markets shall be effectually developed . . . For these reasons, . . . I would never lose the hold which we now have over our great Indian dependency, by far the greatest and most valuable of all the customers we have or ever shall have in this country. For the same reasons I approve of the continued occupation of Egypt, and for the same reasons I have urged upon this government, and upon previous governments, the necessity for using every legitimate opportunity to extend our influence and control in that great African continent which is now being opened up to civilization and to commerce.


Document 6

In spite of the fact that we have no such fleet as we should have, we have conquered for ourselves a place in the sun. It will now be my task to see to it that this place in the sun shall remain our undisputed possession, in order that the sun’s rays may fall fruitfully upon our activity and trade in foreign parts, that our industry and agriculture may develop within the state and our sailing sports upon the water for our future lies upon the water. The more Germans go out upon the water, whether it be in races or regattas, whether it be in journeys across the ocean, or in the service of the battle flag, so much the better it will be for us.

Source: Kaiser Wilhelm II of Germany: Speech to the North German Regatta Association, 1901.

Document 7

It seems to me that God, with infinite wisdom and skill, is training the Anglo-Saxon race for an hour sure to come in the world’s future . . . The unoccupied arable lands of the earth are limited, and will soon be taken . . . Then will the world center upon a new stage of its history—the final competition of races, for which the Anglo-Saxon is being schooled . . . Then this race of unequalled energy . . . the representative, let us hope, of the largest liberty, the purest Christianity, the highest civilization . . . will spread itself over the earth. . . . And can any one doubt that the result of this competition of races will be the “survival of the fittest”?

Source: Josiah Strong (American Protestant Minister), Our Country: Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis, 1885.
**Document 8**

I contend that we (Britons) are the finest race in the world, and the more of the world we inhabit, the better it is for the human race. . . . It is our duty to seize every opportunity of acquiring more territory and we should keep this one idea steadily before our eyes that more territory simply means more of the Anglo-Saxon race, more of the best, the most human, most honourable race the world possesses.

Source: Cecil Rhodes (a British Imperialist), *Confessions of Faith*, 1877.

**Document 9**

. . . In order to keep your forty millions here from eating each other for lack of other victuals, we beyond the seas must keep open as much of the surface of this planet as we can for the overflow of your population to inhabit and . . . create markets where you can dispose of the produce of your factories and of your mines. The Empire, I am always telling you, is a bread-and-butter question. If you have not to be cannibals, you have got to be Imperialists.”

Source: W. T. Stead (an English journalist), *The History of the Mystery*, 1897.

**Document 10**

. . . Imperialism is often confused with commerce or with the opening of commercial markets. . . . Imperialism means something quite different from the sale of purchase of commodities. It entails a profound action on a people and a territory, providing the inhabitants with some education and regular justice, teaching them the division of labour and the uses of capital when they are ignorant of these things. It opens an area not only to the merchandise of the mother country, but to its capital and its savings, to its engineers, to its overseers, to its emigrants. . . . Such a transformation of a barbarian country cannot be accomplished by simple commercial relations.

Section II: Part B—Thematic Essays

(Suggested planning and writing time—70 minutes)
Percent of Section II score—55%

Directions: You are to answer TWO questions, one from each group of three questions below. Make your selections carefully, choosing the questions that you are best prepared to answer thoroughly in the time permitted. You should spend 5 minutes organizing or outlining each essay. In writing your essays, use specific examples to support your answer. If time permits when you finish writing, check your work. Be certain to number your answers as the questions are numbered below.

Group 1
Choose ONE question from this group. The suggested writing time for this question is 30 minutes. You are advised to spend 5 minutes planning your answer in the area below.

1. Compare and contrast the religious ideas of Martin Luther and John Calvin.

2. Discuss and analyze the ideas of John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

3. Discuss and assess the success of Peter the Great (who reigned from 1682 to 1725) in trying to modernize Russia.

Group 2
Choose ONE question from this group. The suggested writing time for this question is 30 minutes. You are advised to spend 5 minutes planning your answer in the area below.

1. Historians have claimed that the Versailles Treaty laid the seeds of distrust that caused World War II. Evaluate to what extent this statement is accurate.

2. Discuss and analyze the causes of the Cold War.

3. Karl Marx wrote that all of history was a class struggle. Discuss and analyze Marx’s view of historical development.
Section II: Free-Response Essays

Part A: First Sample Student DBQ Essay

By 1815, most European countries had very little need for colonies. Adam Smith argued that the burdens of colonialism outweighed its alleged benefits. As late as 1868, Bismarck, chancellor of Germany, thought that there were no advantages to colonies and Benjamin Disraeli, prime minister of Great Britain, called colonies a “millstone around our necks.” These attitudes would come to an abrupt end by the 1880s and Europe would enter the age of the “New Imperialism.” Economic, political, and social factors were behind the birth of this “New Imperialism.” In the years between the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and the New Imperialism of the 1880s, strong, centrally governed nation-states had emerged in Europe. The Industrial Revolution had sparked tremendous economic growth in Europe and Westerners had a renewed pride that they were a unique and gifted people. Inspired by this growth and renewed confidence, Europeans embarked on a path of aggressive nationalism that led to the New Imperialism. Economic motives were important factors in the extensions of the political empires of European countries. The Industrial Revolution created needs that spurred overseas expansion. Many manufacturers wanted access to natural resources and also wanted to expand their markets. W. T. Stead, an English journalist, saw colonies as a “bread and butter issue” that could serve to create markets and could also be a market for their goods that they produced (Doc. 9). Joseph Chamberlain, the British Secretary of State for the colonies, insisted that the only way the government could create more employment and demand was to open up new markets. He argued that Britain should not only continue its occupation of Egypt and India but should extend its influence over Africa (Doc. 5). The French Society of Colonial and Maritime Studies also agreed with Chamberlain's views. They believed that colonies not only provided raw materials but also provided benefits for the mother country (Doc. 2). The quest of new markets, however, was also influenced by the rapid industrialization of Germany, Belgium, and other nations, which were able to satisfy their own home markets and were beginning to protect their markets from imports by establishing tariff barriers. Jules Ferry, twice prime minister of France (1880–81; 1883–85), alluded to that fear when he pointed out that Germany and the United States were setting up trade barriers, creating a shrinking market for French goods (Doc. 4). Thus, government became responsive enough to undertake the conquest of undeveloped territories. Asia and Africa became a special attraction because these areas offered the
raw material needed for the industrial factories of Europe including cotton, silk, vegetable oils, and rare minerals. The products of the tropics were also welcomed in Europe.

Other Europeans argued that colonies also benefited the mother country because they would relieve the problem of overpopulation. W. T. Stead believed that the only way to keep people in England from cannibalism was to relocate many of them in these overseas areas (Doc. 9). The German nationalist historian, Heinrich von Treitschke, argued that only by colonization on a large scale could a civilized country avoid the dangers of overpopulation (Doc. 1). However, Grover Clark, a historian in the 1930s, in a work entitled The Balance Sheet of Imperialism, claimed that most of the European population migrated to the traditional areas in North America and Australia rather than Asia and Africa because they did not offer the climatic or economic conditions necessary to attract large migrations of European settlers to these areas.

Closely connected to the economic motives were political and military issues. Many Europeans were convinced that colonies were essential to a great nation. Treitschke asserted that all great nations must extend their control over “barbarian land” or they would no longer be a great power in the future (Doc. 1). In a speech before the North German Regatta Association, Kaiser Wilhelm II reinforced Treitschke’s view that Germany must expand overseas if she wants to continue to have her “place in the sun” (Doc. 6). In 1884–1885, Bismarck and Ferry called the Berlin Conference to lay down the basic rules for colonizing Africa so that no one European power would dominate the entire continent.

The belief in a “place in the sun” also was connected to military needs. Steam-powered merchant ships and naval vessels required bases around the world to take on coal and supplies. Ferry asserted that the French navy, which could not do without safe harbors and supply centers, inspired the policy of colonial expansion (Doc. 4). Many Westerners during the time were influenced by the ideas of the American naval historian, Alfred T. Mahan, who believed that a strong nation could only survive by expanding its naval power. Of course, a strong navy required that a country acquire coaling and fueling bases around the world.

Humanitarian and religious goals influenced many westerners. Rudyard Kipling, perhaps the most influential of the British writers, encouraged Europeans to “take up the White Man’s Burden.” The goal was to civilize these people and spread Western civilization (Doc. 3). The nineteenth-century French author, Paul Beaulieu, believed that imperialism “provides the inhabitants with some regular education and regular justice.” He also claimed that the overall objective was to transform the barbarian countries (Doc. 10).
Behind the idea of a civilizing mission was the belief in the superiority of the West. Cecil Rhodes, the successful British Imperialist, argued that the more territory the British controlled, the better it was for the world since the Anglo-Saxon race was the most “honourable race” (Doc. 8). Ferry also believed that the superior races had a right over the lower races to spread civilization. Many Westerners had embraced the scientific ideas of Social Darwinism. In 1859, Charles Darwin had published *On the Origin of Species* about the survival of the fittest and Social Darwinists like Herber Spencer applied it to the European race. Some people, such as Josiah Strong, an American Protestant missionary, argued “the Anglo-Saxons were superior and that in the competition for unoccupied land the fittest would survive (Doc. 7).” This meant that imperial conquests and destruction of the weaker races in Asia and Africa were nature’s way of making society better by removing the weakest elements in society.

The emergence of the New Imperialism in Europe in the late 1800s was an outgrowth of the economic, political, and social development that had influenced the continent since the Congress of Vienna in 1814–1815. The economic thrust of robust industrial capitalism, the competitive pressure between the European nations, and the belief that Europeans were the superior race with an obligation to spread their civilization resulted in the transformation of the map in areas of the world such as Africa and Asia.

**Reader’s Comments on Part A: First Sample Student DBQ Essay**

- Has a clear, well-developed thesis.
- The essay is well organized and the student makes use of all of the documents.
- The authorship and point of view of each document is identified, such as Chamberlain, Ferry, and so on.
- The outside information is relevant (Grover Clark) and clarifies and assesses the ideas in the document.
- The student effectively discusses and analyzes the causes of the New Imperialism.

*Possible student score: 8–9*

**Part A: Second Sample Student DBQ Essay**

The New Imperialism had several causes behind its development. During the nineteenth century, many changes were occurring in Europe. These changes spurred many countries to seek colonies. The reasons for Europeans’ taking aggressive steps towards colonizing new lands were many. From these new attitudes about imperialism came a new era in Europe—the age of New Imperialism.

Colonies were seen as a major source of profit to the mother country (Doc. 5). If a country possessed a colony, many profitable consequences resulted. They allowed the country to reap benefits such as an increase in revenue or more access to natural resources to expand markets.
Some countries chose to colonize because they felt it was their natural right to do so. Countries felt that it was their duty to take over lands because they were much more civilized. Europeans saw colonization as a way to spread civilization. Because Europe was much more advanced in technology and the arts, they took colonization as an opportunity to bring their novel ideas to foreign countries, which they saw as less progressive (Doc. 3). Britain especially saw their race as superior (Doc. 8). Because of this superiority, they felt as if they had to spread their race.

Countries also got involved in imperialism for the simple fact of prestige and honor. Those countries that had a lot of colonies were seen as a major world power. A lot of benefits came with having colonies. A country looked better to the outside world if it controlled a great number of colonies. European leaders used their new colonies to enhance their status and give off a better impression.

New Imperialism was a profitable time for Europe. Taking over new colonies was the result of many reasons, such as wanting more natural resources and more prestige. Europe changed dramatically during this time.

Reader’s Comments on Part A: Second Sample Student DBQ Essay

- The thesis statement is never made.
- Insufficient amount of documents listed.
- No supporting data when listing documents.
- Little or no outside relevant information.
- Conclusion is weak.

Possible student score: 1–3

Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–1

Martin Luther (1483–1564) and John Calvin (1509–1564) were in agreement that religious authority rested with the Bible and not the pope. The Bible was the final authority because each individual could read it and determine church practices and doctrine. There was no need for the pope or any higher authority. However, Luther and Calvin disagreed on how to interpret and apply the Scriptures to the community of believers. One of Luther’s major doctrines was “justification by faith alone.” From reading and pondering St. Paul’s letter to the Romans (1:17) found in the New Testament, Luther concluded that what justifies a good man is not what the church knows as works (prayers, the sacraments, and indulgences) but faith alone. Luther rejected the church doctrine that good
deeds were necessary for salvation. The Catholic Church, however, never really taught that indulgences or good works could compensate for the evils of sin. Luther believed that a man did not earn grace by good living; he did good because he possessed the grace of God.

Luther’s faith in the Bible and the power of the individual to read and reflect on scriptures led to the conclusion that the church consisted of the entire community of Christian believers. Luther believed that every person should serve God in his or her individual calling. Medieval churchmen, however, had tended to identify the church with their clergy. Luther, like most Protestants, agreed that the clergy was unnecessary except to serve as pastors of a congregation.

There were two main differences between Calvin and Luther. Calvin had his own ideas about the power of God, the nature of human beings, and the power of the state. Luther had rejected St. Augustine’s idea of predestination. Calvin in The Institutes of Christian Religion made predestination the cornerstone of his religious beliefs. Calvin believed that human beings did not have free will because that would take away from the power of God. Man could not actively work to achieve salvation. God decides (predetermines) at the beginning of time who would be saved and who would be damned. Those predestined for salvation could be identified by their virtuous lives. In time, the elect could be determined by their economic and material success.

Unlike Luther, Calvin did not believe that the church should be ruled by the state. Calvinists did not recognize the subordination of the church to the state or the right of any government, king, or parliament to lay down laws for religion. Calvin believed in setting up a theocratic government run by church leaders.

Luther and Calvin agreed on the basic issues of the authority of the pope and the role of the individual in the church. However, they disagreed on how to interpret the role of God and the individual in society.

Reader’s Comments on Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–1

- Thesis is stated clearly and developed throughout the essay.
- Specifically accounts for the differences between Luther and Calvin.
- Supports thesis with specific information, with references to St. Paul, St. Augustine.
- Conclusion could be stronger.

Possible student score: 7–9 (more toward the lower end of the scale)
Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–1

Martin Luther and John Calvin both brought new ideas about religion to their countries. They both definitely saw flaws in the Roman Catholic Church as it was. While they did agree on some major concepts, they did not see eye to eye on some issues.

Luther and Calvin both acknowledged that there was really no need for a pope in the church. They believed that real authority came from the Bible and not from what a priest said or did.

Luther, unlike Calvin, felt that the church should be run by the state. He also believed that an individual could interpret and reflect on the Bible in his/her own way. Luther also claimed that faith alone was good enough to achieve salvation.

Calvin did not believe in the church and state being separate. He hoped for a government ruled by the leaders of the church. The main idea behind Calvinism was the concept of predestination. Calvin did not feel that a person could do anything during his/her life to help achieve salvation. Luther did not believe in predestination.

Luther and Calvin were both pioneers in bringing about changes in how people practiced and viewed religion. They both were committed to correcting the flaws in the Roman Catholic Church. However, they failed to agree on certain ideas, which led to the creation of two different religions—Lutheranism and Calvinism.

Reader’s Comments on Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–1

■ Thesis statement is poorly made.
■ Organization is weak.
■ No elaboration of differences, such as Luther’s views on the state.
■ Fails to analyze the importance of predestination.

Possible student score: 1–3

Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–2

John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau agreed about man and the state of nature and the meaning of the social contract but drew different conclusions from these basic areas of agreement. John Locke was a political thinker and Jean Jacques Rousseau was a social philosopher. Locke’s Two Treatises on Government and Rousseau’s Social Contract would influence political thinkers for many years. John Locke, who was born into an Anglican family
with Puritan leanings, was forced to flee England during the reign of Charles II (1660–1685) for his liberal views. In 1689, after James II was overthrown, Locke returned to England. In 1690, he published the *Two Treatises on Government* to justify the English Parliament in the Glorious Revolution. Locke argued that James II had violated nature’s law and deserved to be deposed. Locke asserted that men are born free in the state of nature where they are happy, free, and entitled to the natural right of life, liberty, and property. To protect these rights, men formed societies by a social contract and transferred to the government the obligation of safeguarding these rights. If the government, which was party to the compact, failed to live up to this contract, the people have a right to overthrow it. This is what happened in England in 1688 and James II deserved to be deposed.

Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778) was born into a poor family and led a disorganized life and felt uncomfortable in the social world of the Enlightenment. His book *The Social Contract* was published in France in 1762. Rousseau began with Locke’s ideas of the state of nature but he arrived at a different conclusion. He believed like Locke that man in the state of nature had certain rights. However, they disagreed after this. After people enter into a social contract to form a government, they give up all their rights to the control of the community and must submit to the general will. The general will is a kind of ideal representing what was best for the whole state, a will for the general good. If someone disagreed with the general will, it became necessary to “force a man to be free.” The general will controls everything.

Locke and Rousseau began with the belief in the natural law and the state of nature but they reached different conclusions. Locke’s ideas would influence the right of people to overthrow the government, and the right of revolution would echo throughout Europe and in the British colonies in America. Rousseau’s ideas fanned the flame of revolution, but dictators have used his focus on the right of the community over the individual in order to justify their undemocratic governments.

**Reader’s Comments on Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–2**

- Thesis is clearly stated but simplistic.
- Specifically points out the areas of agreement but also differences between Locke and Rousseau (general will; rights of individual versus community).
- Fails to evaluate the full implication of the general will.
- The conclusion is good.

*Possible student score: 4–5*
Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–2

John Locke and Jean Jacques Rousseau were two political thinkers who promoted the belief in the social contract and the state of nature. Locke wrote at the time of the Glorious Revolution and Rousseau wrote during the French Revolution. Locke and Rousseau believed in a social contract in which people entered to establish a government. Locke believed that this social contract or compact insured that Great Britain’s government would protect the rights of the people.

Rousseau believed that government was a contract but the community was more important than the person. This idea led to problems for future years. The question of what was the general will lead to problems about the meaning of the social contract. Locke’s social contract led to democracy.

Both Locke and Rousseau agreed on a social contract but disagreed on how society should interpret it.

Reader’s Comments on Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–2

- There is no thesis statement.
- There is no real analysis of how Locke and Rousseau differ on the Social Contract.
- There are factual errors, such as that Rousseau did not write during the French Revolution. (He died in 1778.)
- The essay does not refer to the bodies of work of Locke and Rousseau.
- The essay is very superficial.

Possible student score: 1–3

Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–3

Peter the Great was one of Russia’s most influential leaders. Throughout his 36-year rule, he strove to constantly ensure that Russia became more modern—thus, more Western. He also ceaselessly built up and reformed the Russian army. While many of Peter the Great’s reforms had positive effects on Russia, when his reign ended in 1725, the state of Russia was still very uncertain, and was not fully modernized.

Although Peter the Great came to the Russian throne in 1682 at the age of ten, he did not take control of the government until seven years later. Peter was not well educated, but his immense curiosity played a role in how he ruled. In the late seventeenth century, Peter traveled to European cities to observe their political, social, and economical practices. He took back to Russia not only his observations on life in Western Europe, but also a group of scholars, soldiers, and noblemen whom he had recruited and gathered throughout his travels. He would use these people and his observations to modernize Russia.
One of Peter the Great’s most sweeping reforms was that of the Russian army. Before Peter’s reign, the army was feeble, with part-time soldiers who were unskilled in modern military techniques. To improve Russia’s military, Peter required that all noblemen serve in the army, or in civil service. In recognition of the skilled nature of many Western armies, Peter set up schools and universities to teach his noble soldiers the correct military techniques. Peter established a standing, regular army of 200,000 men, mainly commoners, who were required to serve in the military.

In addition to changes to Russia’s military, Peter the Great felt it necessary to centralize his power, and he did so by bringing all Russians—including the Orthodox Church—under his control. He insisted that all of Russia would follow the European calendar, with the New Year starting on January 1, rather than on September 1. In response to the practices he had observed while in Western Europe, Peter insisted that nobles shave their beards and dress in modern, Western-style clothing, in place of their old-fashioned robes and beards. Women were no longer required to veil their faces in public and were not required to seclude themselves in their houses. He invited women to his lavish parties, much to the disapproval of many citizens. In addition, Peter put an end to arranged marriages.

By the end of Peter the Great’s reign, Russia had made great strides in many other areas. He increased the number of factories in Russia, and encouraged the exportation of Russian goods. Peter was responsible for making potatoes the staple crop of Russia. He simplified the Russian alphabet and developed Russia’s system of education by forming academies to study mathematics, engineering, and science.

The greatest symbol of Peter’s reign was the capital city of St. Petersburg. Located near the Baltic coast, St. Petersburg was a lavish city that was built mainly because Peter forced thousands of serfs to drain the swamps near the city. Many of these serfs died in the process, but after their work was done, Peter brought Italian architects and artisans to design a “Western” city.

Despite these numerous reforms and advances, Peter the Great was not entirely successful in modernizing Russia—for example, he failed to gain a warm water port that could remain open year round. During his 36-year rule, Peter and his army were constantly engaged in battle, yet Peter’s territorial gains were minimal, at best. In general, Peter the Great did not leave a lasting legacy upon his death in 1725. Because he ruled primarily by fear tactics, many of his policies did not last after his death.
Peter the Great’s biggest failure was his reliance on serfdom. The serfs who had helped to build his “window to the West” were actually holding Russia back from true modernization. As Peter continued to bring Western ideas into Russia, the divide between the poor and the educated elite widened. There was great hatred of Peter among those who were forced to work the land as serfs, as they saw no benefits to Peter’s modernization. By clinging to a system of serfdom that had long been abolished in the rest of Europe, Peter the Great failed to fully modernize and Westernize Russia.

**Reader’s Comments on Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–3**

- Information is organized and fully supports the thesis.
- Good factual information about Peter’s efforts to improve the military life at the court. However, there is an error in the number of years that he ruled. (It should be 43, not 36.)
- Conclusion is detailed and analytical.

*Possible student score: 8–9*

**Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–3**

Peter the Great ruled Russia from the late seventeenth century until the early eighteenth century. He tried to Westernize Russia through various economic and social reforms. He also built up the Russian military. His reforms were very successful and Russia became more like the other Western European nations due to Peter’s reign.

Peter the Great wanted to make Russia as modern as other Western European nations. He studied other countries’ political, economic, and social systems and used what he had learned in ruling Russia. His ultimate goal was to make Russia the most powerful and modern nation in Europe.

Peter improved Russia’s economy by building more factories and trading with other countries. He also improved Russia’s system of education. He treated women better, and invited them to parties at his castles. Peter forced men to shave their beards and made them dress the way people in the West were dressing. He tried to control all aspects of Russia, including religion. He did not let Russian Orthodox citizens practice their religion freely.

Peter greatly improved Russia’s military. He made it more similar to armies in Western European countries, and he forced Russian noblemen to serve in the army. He also forced the peasants to serve in the army, so that Russia would have a full-time military. This was one way that he saw he could be more like Western European nations. He also taught the noblemen in his army how to fight properly.
Peter was a harsh leader. He relied on serfs to make many of his reforms. Serfs built Peter’s capital city of St. Petersburg, and many of them died in the process. St. Petersburg was Peter the Great’s vision of Westernization, and he achieved his goal at any cost, even if it meant the death of his citizens.

Peter’s reforms were both good and bad for Russia. He did help to modernize Russia, although he treated the Russian peasants very poorly. This prevented Russia from being as modern a nation as possible.

Reader’s Comments on Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 1–3

- Thesis statement is weak.
- Factual information is weak, too general.
- Some information is inaccurate: Peter the Great did allow the Russians to practice their religion.
- Very superficial treatment.
- Conclusion is weak.

Possible student score: 2–3

Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–1

The Versailles Treaty that ended World War I provided a temporary truce between England and France for dominance on the European continent. On November 11, 1918, Germany had signed the Armistice with the Western powers based on the belief that President Woodrow Wilson’s ideals of the Fourteen Points would be the basis of the negotiated peace treaty. When the new German government, the Weimar Republic, refused to sign the treaty because of its harshness, the Western leaders informed Germany that they had to sign it or be prepared to resume hostilities. The severe restriction of the Versailles Treaty led to the belief in Germany that the country had been “stabbed in the back.” This slogan would provide the rallying cry for the Nazis’ rise to power, whose main goal was to readdress the injustices of the Versailles Treaty.

The Versailles Treaty created bitterness among the German people. Germany resented Article 231, the War Guilt Clause, which required them to accept full responsibility for the war and pay the reparation costs that amounted to over $132 billion. The Germans also were angry that their military force was limited to 100,000 men, and Germany was stripped of its overseas colonies.

Adolf Hitler and the Nazis exploited this bitterness and focused on nationalists who refused to accept their defeat in World War I. Although Hitler and his National Socialist Party never received a majority of the votes, he
was to portray the Weimar Republic as the government that had betrayed Germany. The economic condition of runaway inflation caused by the reparations debt imposed by the Versailles Treaty added to the discontent towards the Weimar Republic.

Hitler was also able to appeal to the extreme nationalists because he pointed out that the Versailles Treaty had removed valuable lands from the German Empire. Hitler struck a responsive chord with the German people when he demanded that the Sudetenland, a region of Czechoslovakia where German-speaking people lived, be returned. Germans were also angry that they had lost Danzig to Poland in the Versailles Treaty. Danzig, which had been an old German town, was given to Poland so that Poland could have an outlet to the sea, but it cut off the bulk of Germany from East Prussia.

Other countries also resented the Versailles Treaty. Italy had walked out of the conference because it did not get all the land it wanted. The United States rejected the treaty and the League of Nations’ effectiveness was diminished. Japan was angry that the West refused to recognize its claims in China. Russia was angry because it had been excluded from the conference and lost the Baltic States. By the 1930s, England and France began to believe that the Versailles Treaty was unfair and that Hitler was correct in seeking to address the injustices. The Versailles Treaty did lay the seeds of distrust that led to World War II. The treaty was a factor that led to World War II, but the economic crisis created by the Great Depression and Adolf Hitler’s ideas, leadership, and his ability to exploit these conditions also led to World War II.

**Reader’s Comments on Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–1**

- Thesis is clearly stated.
- The essay addresses the specific criticisms of the Versailles Treaty.
- Uses good detail and linkage with Versailles and the German people.
- The section on Hitler is well developed.
- Could have developed the conclusion more.

*Possible student score: 7–9*

**Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–1**

Many people believe that the Treaty of Versailles was one of the biggest reasons for World War II. The Treaty of Versailles ended World War I. It placed blame for the war on Germany, and made Germany pay other countries many billions of dollars. The people of Germany were very angry because of this, and they began to resent that the
The Treaty of Versailles also required that the Germans have a much smaller army than they did at the start of World War I. This part of the treaty was an attempt to try to stop something like World War I from happening again. Germany resented this clause of the treaty, and their resentment eventually led to World War II.

While the Treaty of Versailles did not start World War II, it played a big role because the Germans felt angry because of what they had been forced to accept. Adolf Hitler, the man behind the start of World War II, used the anger of the German people to rise to power. After World War I, Germany’s economy was bad and it was hard for people to find jobs. People became more and more angry, and blamed their bad situation on the Treaty of Versailles, which had forced Germany to pay billions of dollars to other European nations.

The Treaty of Versailles, which ended World War I, played a major role in the cause of World War II. The German people were angry at having to accept complete blame for the war, and Adolf Hitler capitalized on this anger. His rule eventually led to World War II.

**Reader’s Comments on Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–1**

- Factual information is weak.
- No details about Hitler or the Great Depression.
- Very superficial.

*Possible student score: 1–3*

**Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–2**

At the end of World War II, most of Europe was in shambles and devastated from the war. However, out of this turmoil two super powers managed to emerge—the United States and the Soviet Union. These two countries were able to acquire enough economic resources and military might to dominate the world. Yet, with this new power came tense rivalry and a world becoming more and more divided. These tensions ultimately led to the Cold War.

The Cold War began some time after the end of World War II. It was a period of severe tension and hostility between the West and the Soviet Union without actual armed conflicts between the nations. The cause of this tension rested in the fact that Stalin in Eastern Europe had very different goals as compared to the Western powers.
As a result of seeing the horrors of the Nazi regime, the United States became an even bigger supporter of democracy. The United States believed that strengthening democracy would ensure tolerance and peace. Most Western Allies built new governments that focused on democratic constitutions to protect the rights of all citizens. The teaching of democratic principles was emphasized throughout the West.

Stalin, the leader of Russia at this time, had a different view about how to govern a country. He wanted Communism to spread throughout his country. Stalin also wished to protect Russia from any further invasions by the Germans. Stalin had his Red Army occupy lands in Eastern Europe. Stalin hoped that the West would accept this occupation.

However, Western leaders, such as Roosevelt and Churchill, did not agree to such a thing. They both rejected Stalin’s view. Stalin chose to ignore the West’s arguments and managed to install pro-Soviet Communist governments throughout Eastern Europe. This was done by destroying all rival political parties and even assassinating democratic leaders.

These acts committed by Stalin further increased the tension between Eastern Europe and the West. Churchill claimed that an “Iron Curtain” had descended across the continent. This term expressed the growing fear of Communism, which led to greater tensions. The United States took a bigger stand on democracy. In 1947, President Truman wrote a policy that stated that the United States would support any people who were trying to resist outside pressures. This policy came to be known as the Truman Doctrine. He made it clear to Stalin and all of Eastern Europe that the U.S. would resist any sort of expansion of Communism no matter where or at what cost. This policy instilled more fear in the East and helped to further increase tensions. The Marshall Plan, which assisted democratic countries who were in economic need, further angered Stalin. Tensions over Germany led to the Berlin Blockade, which was resolved by a dramatic airlift that only added to the tensions between the West and the Soviet Union. In 1949, the creation of NATO, a defensive alliance against the spread of Communism, resulted in the formation of the Warsaw Pact by the Soviet bloc of nations. Tension between the United States and Russia was also escalated by the nuclear race. The arms race created the fear that nuclear warfare was a possibility and could destroy the world.
Both sides made many efforts to support their cause. The West, led by the United States, stood firm in its belief that democracy was the best government and that the spread of Communism had to be contained. The Soviet Union under Stalin was determined to ensure the supremacy of the Soviet Empire. These two opposing views led to the intense rivalry of the Cold War, which lasted for over 40 years.

**Reader’s Comments on Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–2**

- The thesis statement is good.
- The essay is rich in detail but lacks analysis.
- Conclusion is weak.

*Possible student score: 5–7*

**Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–2**

There were many reasons why a Cold War existed between the West and the East after 1945. This war, which was called a Cold War because it did not involve any armed conflict between nations, led to over 40 years of severe tension between those countries that were democratic and those which were Communist.

The West, most especially the United States, believed that democracy was the best form of government. They did all that they could to spread democracy throughout the West. Stalin did not agree with the Western ideas. He felt that the best government was Communism. He spread this form of government through the East. Soon Europe was divided into the Eastern Soviet dominated region and the Western region.

Increasing tension forced both the East and the West to use all of their resources to further strengthen their side. The United States did not stay isolated but became a major world power in its support of democracy. Stalin grew more suspicious of the West, which caused the tension to mount even more. Stalin did all that he could to ensure that the East remains a strong Communist force.

The main reason behind the Cold War was the two opposing views held in the East and the West. The West supported democracy while the East claimed Communism was superior. This conflict led to severe tensions, which would last for more than 40 years and result in ongoing conflicts between the West and the East.
Reader’s Comments on Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–2

- Thesis statement is not clear.
- Few or no basic facts.
- Redundant sentence structure.
- Conclusion is poor.

Possible student score: 1–2

Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–3

Karl Marx (1818–1883) was a German writer and economist who is considered the Father of Communism. Marx wrote *The Communist Manifesto* in which he outlined his main political philosophy. Marx based his ideas in part on the teachings of the German philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, who taught that history was a dialectic that was constantly changing as new ideas came into conflict with one another.

Like Hegel, Marx believed that history was a constant conflict. However, Marx believed that economic conditions, not ideas, determined the course of history. The class that possessed the economic power controlled the government and institutions. Laws and social systems are all developed in accord with society’s economic base. No ruling class has ever been willing to give up power. The only way to achieve change was through revolution. Thus, conflict between classes was inevitable. Marx asserts that history was a struggle between the “haves and have-nots.” Marx pointed out that in ancient times, the conflict was between the patrician and the plebeian. In the Middle Ages the struggle was between the lord and the serf. In the present day of the industrial society, the struggle is between the capitalist and the proletariat. Marx believed that the industrial society of capitalism was only a temporary phase. As the backbone of capitalism, the proletariat was the true productive class. Marx predicted that workers (proletariat) would seize control of the government from the capitalists and build a society in which the people owned everything. Without private property there would be a classless society and the government would wither away. The last stage of history for Marx would be pure Communism in which the goal would be “from each according to his ability to each according to his needs.” The Marx view of history leaves out the importance of nationalism and religion. In his appeal that “working men of all countries unite,” Marx did not realize that nationalism was a major part of history. The destruction of the Berlin Wall in 1989 demonstrated that Germans
were German first and then Communists. Furthermore, Marx was writing at a time when the gap between the working poor contrasted sharply with the wealthy industrialists. Marx’s prediction about the workers was erroneous. By 1900, conditions in Western Europe had changed. Workers, through unions, began to improve their standards of living. Rather than overthrow the government, workers gained the right to vote and used it to correct some of the injustices. Finally, Marx’s prediction about Communist revolutions occurring in an industrial country was also misguided. The Communist Revolution took place in an agricultural country which according to Marx was not ripe for revolution. The State did not wither away but became more powerful.

Although Marx’s view of history as a class struggle was erroneous, his philosophy had powerful appeal to the people. Marx’s belief that economics determine history was a scientific analysis of human events which guaranteed the rise of Communism and its conclusion. Like religion, which guaranteed paradise in the afterlife, Marx promised happiness on earth. Marx’s appeal was that he made Communism into a material religion.

Reader’s Comments on Part B: First Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–3

- Thesis statement is not clear.
- Rich in facts, but misplaced information. Marx’s economic ideas are contained in Das Kapital and reference to Hegel should be Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel.
- Good analysis of errors behind Marx’s ideas.
- Conclusion is creative but needs greater analysis.

Possible student score: 7–8

Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–3

Marx’s view that all history was a class struggle helped to explain why society developed as it did in the past. In 1848, Karl Marx wrote The Communist Manifesto in response to the problems created by the Industrial Revolution. Marx believed that the difficult conditions that existed under capitalism made it inevitable that Communism would be successful. The problems of society were so bad that the worker thought he had no hope for the future. He worked 10–12 hours per day and there was no protection against accidents. Marx predicted that when the Communists gained control of society there would not be a division between workers and owners. A classless society would develop and the lack of goods would no longer create conflict.
In history, Marx predicted that there has always been a class struggle because the rich always seem to be getting richer by exploiting the poor. Under Communism, this exploitation would stop because there would no longer be any private property. Marx also predicted that there would be worldwide revolutions that would affect every country. Marx’s prediction, however, never came true because Communism only came to Russia and China.

**Reader’s Comments on Part B: Second Sample Student Thematic Essay, Group 2–3**

- Thesis statement is not clear.
- No analysis of facts such as the difficult conditions during the Industrial Revolution.
- Very general, no details.

*Possible student score: 1–3*