CROSS**CURRENTS**

Aristotle's Common Topics Meet the AP® History Courses

by Christopher Freiler
& Stephen Heller

CROSS**CURRENTS**
A BIRD'S EYE VIEW

CROSSCURRENTS is and in-depth guide to the art of historical interpretation and argument for Advanced Placement and college-level history courses.

By bridging the gap between historical and rhetorical thinking and writing skills, CROSSCURRENTS serves as an interdisciplinary guide to engaging in meaningful inquiry with primary and secondary sources and writing strong academic essays. CROSSCURRENTS is founded on the belief shared by both authors—a "history" teacher and an "English" teacher—that by finding the crosscurrents between disciplines, we provide students with richer practice and greater capacity to develop skills and creativity.

Primary Aims

- An interdisciplinary approach to reading and writing that deepens student learning, with an emphasis on the relationship between reading, thinking, and writing
- How to read a text both historically and rhetorically. The two different forms of inline annotation are denoted by icons:

- How to apply principles of argumentation and rhetoric to historical argument in AP U.S. History, AP World History, and AP European History
- How to find the best available means to make your arguments credible and persuasive in support of the AP History writing rubrics

Basic Framework

Chapters 1–5 feature the purpose and application of Aristotle's Common Topics, which serve as the framework for all written arguments. The final chapter features a sample Document-Based Question (DBQ) with responses that illustrate the interplay of the Common Topics and creative ways of using multiple strategies in your toolkit.

Chapter	Topic
1	Definition
2	Circumstance
3	Comparison
4	Relationship
5	Testimony
6	Putting It All Together

Chapter Features

- Instruction on how the Common Topic in focus applies to history and critical thinking
- Sample argument prompts with readings for AP U.S. History, AP World History, and AP European History
- Historical and rhetorical annotations on a range of primary and secondary texts, including historiography, biography, speech, artwork, film, and poetry
- Integration of the official 6 Historical Thinking Skills and 3 Reasoning Processes
- Templates to facilitate student thinking and writing
- Sample student responses that illustrate the Advanced Placement History rubrics (including the updates for the 2024 exam)
- Cross-references to earlier and later chapters, in order to enhance student approaches to reading and writing

The Companion Website

Visit the CROSSCURRENTS companion website for additional resources. Subscribe to the CROSSCURRENTS mailing list to be notified of new resources as they become available.

https://www.sherpalearning.com/crosscurrents

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: **DEFINITIONS**

CHAPTER 2: **CIRCUMSTANCE**

CHAPTER 3: **COMPARISONS**

CHAPTER 4: **RELATIONSHIPS**

CHAPTER 5: **TESTIMONY**

CHAPTER 6: **PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER**

This chapter has been abridged for the sample.

CHAPTER 1
DEFINITIONS

WHAT IS A DEFINITION?

A Definition provides greater direction and reasoning for your audience. Think of your argument as a river, and your audience follows the flow of your reasoning. Providing a Definition is an eddy—a resting pool for your audience to reflect on your argument, consider nuance, and determine your initial thoughts about the argument.

For example, much of the recent arguments about responses to COVID focused on whether decisions were "democratic." In defending our argument through Definition, we have various options:

1) Etymology

We could provide the etymology of the word: *demos* (in Greek), which means "the people," and *kratia*, which means "power or rule." Understanding the history of words and how they are used can inform our arguments. So, in claiming that giving students the option of coming to school with a mask is *democratic*, we could rely upon a literal meaning of that word.

Closely related to etymology is what we may call an **operational** or a **procedural definition**. We have a sense of how things operate because that's the way it's been done in the past. Democracy means majority rule, yes? The will of the people? Routine has a powerful hold on our definitions: what does it mean to be "educated"? "successful"? "civil"? The institutions that shape your lives—schools, family, government—have much to do with your definitions of these terms. And even when we are presented with indisputable evidence that we can and should revise our definitions, our emotional attachments make it hard to sustain our new views. Consider the recent spate of texts that discourage students from chasing "bumper sticker" approaches towards college and education: *Where You Go Is Not Who You'll Be, Gatekeepers, The Years That Matter Most*. Yet, will these books be enough to get students to reconsider their view of what it means to be educated?

2) Description

But when we are accustomed to hearing the word used repeatedly, we may come to accept its meaning without returning to that resting spot in the eddy. How can we fully know "the rule of the people" when there are no answer keys on dealing with COVID? We may need to **describe** what the word means as a way of getting at the word's essence. We may provide more telling details—e.g., democracy assumes the *majority* of the people, or *democracy* assumes public welfare over individual rights. And just as there are different shades of a color, we can also examine different shades (or types) of democracy: *direct* democracy, *representative* democracy, *constitutional* democracy.

3) Examples

The need to define—or more commonly to *re-define*—a term is often driven by examples, and these examples typically serve as precedents to ground our new definition. Returning to that metaphor of a river, we may see the first half of the argument as an examination of how public health matters have been handled by a representative government, be it the Spanish Flu of 1918, the polio epidemic, SARS, and now COVID. Of course, addressing public health issues is only one facet of democratic rule, and so we return to the eddy to consider other factors in understanding the term *democratic*. You may examine the *patterns* of successes or limitations in how well the crisis is addressed—along with the many other responsibilities of a democracy, and you broaden your definition of *democratic* to take into account the issue of public health. Does "welfare" entail "public health"? Do my individual freedoms remain constant when such actions may adversely impact others? In answering these questions we marshal the available evidence to broaden our understanding of the term—in the service of bringing more people over to our point of view.

4) Metaphor

> **AP® TIP**
>
> A relevant and pithy quote can serve as a powerful indication of your learning as well as distill a complex issue. For example, a student may argue in an essay on the Thirty Years War that it was the "final nail in the coffin of medieval Europe." Notice how this *bon mot* says so much about the war's transformative effect on politics and diplomacy.

The poet Robert Frost claimed that all learning is based upon metaphor, and it is through our ability to conceptualize abstract terms that we become more insightful and communicative. Consider the opening example of arguments as a river and eddy; this is an effort to provide an illustrative comparison to an abstract concept. Analogies serve to elevate an audience by providing more concrete images that symbolize a larger idea. **Metaphors**, **synonyms**, and **antonyms** also help to define (or illustrate) a term. Suppose, for example, you are concerned with the economic disparities that our current democracy has helped cultivate. You see marginalized groups lacking political access—as a result of laws, precedent, and attitudes that our democracy has yet to curtail—and you wish to paint a picture for your audience that warns against what democracy shouldn't be. You could say, for example, that democracy is "not an expensive restaurant," where only those with privilege and resources have access. Socratic reasoning assists here, especially as we consider what a concept IS, IS NOT (or argument by negation), and what's RELATED to it.

What Democracy IS, IS NOT, and What's RELATED

IS	IS NOT	RELATED
based upon the common good	top-down directives from the federal government	majority rule
a restaurant willing to serve anyone	free from responsibility	public health
compromise	economic progress	environmental safety

WHY DOES IT MATTER FOR ONESELF? AND FOR OTHERS?

First and foremost, a definitional move acknowledges context. Context changes over time and is determined by factors both larger—events, belief systems, laws, practices—and smaller—family, relationships, perceptions. When writers or speakers use important terms in their text, like *service* or *democracy*, they are tapping into their audience's current understanding of that term. A writer's choice to redefine that term invites a recognition that the context has changed, and we wish to enlighten our audience to that effect. One of the most recognizable examples is The Gettysburg Address, where Lincoln redefines the notion of independence, originally conceived in 1776, to be a more inclusive moment, and he uses the horrors of the battlefield to provide context for his definition. Or in 2023, how we understand the meaning of *service* or *welfare* may be influenced by events such as the Recession of 2008 or the 2020 pandemic. Whether it be to identify a historical time period, contextualize a key term, or evaluate a particular policy or ideology, the ability to define—or more broadly, to re-define—makes your argument your own. This is an important point: definitions are in service to your larger argument. They are tethered to a broader purpose and goal for your intended audience. In fact, your ability to recognize *previous* definitions of a key term adds artistry and complexity to your argument, as you embrace a wider range of perspectives and stakeholders.

DECONSTRUCTING HISTORICAL ARGUMENT THROUGH DEFINITIONS

You may have observed two or more people arguing over an evaluative claim, such as: "*Parasite* is the best movie" or "The Internet is the greatest invention of the twentieth century." Many such arguments do not get very far and can descend into raised voices or anger, rather than clarity and mutual understanding. Any good argument or debate must begin with defining terms.

The examples above would generally not drive historical inquiry; however, they highlight the importance of precision in evaluating any term or concept. Let's look at a principle often implicit in historical narratives: "progress." Many historians, for example, characterize the nineteenth century as an era of impressive progress. You've likely used this term yourself in conversation or

writing. Think for a moment what is conjured by the term. Perhaps what came to mind first was technology; certainly, the nineteenth century witnessed immense advances in technology, often associated with the Industrial Revolution. The same is true today: we consider our current level of progress as embracing many technologies, from smartphones to genetic engineering. The question is whether progress equals technological advance? Would it be possible for humanity to progress without widespread technological innovation? Or, on the other hand, for technological dynamism to cause regression? [Spoiler alert: this question is answered by Anthony Doerr.] Even College Board AP® Prompts have explicitly asked for definitional arguments. For example, on the 2023 U.S. History DBQ prompt students were asked to write about the changes to the definition of citizenship between 1865 and 1920.

As noted above, there are distinct ways of defining concepts. In historical argument, an effective definition should: 1) break down the term into its component parts, 2) be situated in historical context, 3) be precise and neutral, and 4) avoid using the term in the definition. Conceptual analysis is much like chemical analysis: breaking a thing down into its essential components. For example, water is made of hydrogen and oxygen, and a bachelor is composed of being unmarried and male. All concepts have *essential* (or necessary) and *sufficient* characteristics. An essential characteristic is one without which the term in question wouldn't be what it is. A bachelor could not be married, or he would not be a bachelor. But being unmarried is not sufficient to be a bachelor; one must also be a male. Therefore, being unmarried and being male are the necessary and sufficient conditions for being a bachelor. Let's return to the notion of progress.

READINGS AND SAMPLE PROMPTS

To see the application of Definition in writing, we turn to a more specific historical question and associated tasks. One of the major concepts defining the history of the United States is "the frontier." Before reading further, take a moment and consider what images your mind conjures with the term "frontier."

UNITED STATES HISTORY EXAMPLES

Now we'll look at a classic Definition of the frontier from an influential historian. At the 1893 meeting of the American Historical Association, which coincided with the famous Columbian World's Fair in Chicago, Frederick Jackson Turner presented an influential talk on the frontier. Turner delivered his talk in the context of the 1890 Census, which suggested that the American frontier no longer existed. For Turner, the "closing of the frontier" represented a momentous change in American society. Within his talk, Turner laid out the meaning and significance of the frontier for American history. Keep in mind that Turner's account serves as a secondary source, that is, an interpretive account by a historian, which may be based on a primary source (e.g., the 1890 Census), a first-hand account or document from the period in question. However, please note that Turner's account could also function as a primary source, for, say, the historian investigating attitudes about the American west or frontier. As you read the passage below, please note the annotations.

HISTORICAL ANNOTATIONS

Frederick Jackson Turner, historian, speech to the American Historical Association, 1890

RHETORICAL ANNOTATIONS

Here Turner establishes the location of America's first colonies on the Atlantic coast and the notion that historical evolution involves the movement toward advanced political and economic institutions, such as manufacturing.

Limiting our attention to the Atlantic coast, we have the familiar phenomenon of the evolution of institutions in a limited area, such as the rise of representative government…into complex organs; the progress from primitive industrial society, without division of labor, up to manufacturing civilization.

Turner invokes a familiar (or operational) Definition of the frontier.

But we have in addition to this a recurrence of the process of evolution in each western area reached in the process of expansion. Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area. American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of primitive society, furnish the forces dominating American character. The true point of view in the history of this nation is not the Atlantic coast, it is the Great West. Even the slavery struggle…occupies its important place in American history because of its relation to westward expansion.

In this advance, the frontier is the outer edge of the wave—the meeting point between savagery and civilization. Much has been written about the frontier from the point of view of border warfare and the chase, but as a field for the serious study of the economist and the historian it has been neglected.

In contrast to the "civilization" east of the frontier, the movement of populations into new western territories produces a return to primitive conditions and a new process of development.

Turner views the encounter with the frontier as symbolic of the "American character."

Though the "east" represents "civilization," it is the western frontier that defines the issues and course of American history.

Though he does not state it directly, Turner considers the existing Native American peoples, who were presumably "civilized" by those Anglo-Americans expanding into the west, as representative of the savagery of the frontier.

Note how Turner's Definition introduces key terms. In Socratic thinking, we often view definitions as what something is, is not, and what is related to it.

Turner's Definition of frontier is in service to his larger argument about the "American character."

Note how Turner's "true point of view" signals his context through which to understand America.

Turner implies that the American "character" features a need to civilize the "savages." Note too how Turner's Definition depends upon a more modern audience, one more willing to consider social history as integral as geographic history.

APPLICATION & CONVERSATION 1.1

Based on the passage and the annotations, could you now write out a Definition of Turner's frontier?

Write your response in a separate document. Share your insights with your partner once they've drafted their own response.

For Turner, the frontier is a line, running north-and-south across the North American continent, dividing the established institutions and civilization of the east from the undeveloped and open lands of the west, inhabited only by primitive Indian tribes. Thus, the movement of the frontier means the expansion of American freedom and civilization across space and time, culminating with the dominion of its economic, political, and social forms.

WORLD HISTORY EXAMPLES

For one last exercise in this chapter, we look at World History, specifically the idea of revolution. This concept defines many critical moments and eras in history. *Revolution* usually entails a political upheaval, but it can also comprise intellectual and cultural transformation. Most historical studies on this topic concentrate on a single revolution, like the French or Russian, which makes sense given the complexity of revolutions in their causes, course, and consequences. However, historian Crane Brinton wrote a classic study of revolutions (*The Anatomy of Revolution*) in which he attempted to identify patterns common to each such upheaval. Here's how he defines *revolution*:

HISTORICAL ANNOTATIONS

Crane Brinton, American historian, *The Anatomy of Revolution*, 1938

RHETORICAL ANNOTATIONS

Brinton acknowledges the multiple meanings of the term—and perhaps its misuse—but aims at a core Definition.

For though we use the noun 'revolution,' and still more perhaps its adjective 'revolutionary,' to indicate a most varied set of changes, we keep in the corners of our mind a much more definite meaning, a kind of central tough core not eroded out into looser strata of meaning. We think of the great overturns in previously stable political societies in the past—the English Revolution of the 1640s and its sequel in 1688, the American Revolution, the French Revolution and its nineteenth-century sequels, the Russian Revolution of 1917 and its twentieth-century sequels; or we think of nationalist revolutions like the twentieth-century revolutions in Ireland and Algeria. We may also think of violence and terror, purges and guillotines. But our focus is on drastic, sudden substitution of one group in charge of the running of a territorial political entity by another group hitherto not running that government. There is one further implication: the revolutionary substitution of one group for another, if not made by actual violent uprising, is made by *coup d'etat*, *Putsch*, or some other kind of skullduggery. If the change is made without violence in a free election, as in the British election of 1945 which gave socialism power (to most of us Americans a revolutionary thing), then the strongest expression the commentators can allow themselves is the 'British revolution by consent.' But is a revolution by consent really a revolution?

Brinton's exemplification continues to distinguish between ideology and institution.

By noting these instances of revolution, Brinton conjures for the reader a series of familiar images and associations with "revolution."

Revolutions can occur in ideas or economic systems, but Brinton has in mind those political actions that entail violent upheaval and the replacement of one type of regime with another.

In addition to providing examples to illustrate his Definition, Brinton looks at the relationship between the individuals, institutions, and ideologies—what we are calling the "3 I's" here. The Common Topic of Comparison (Ch. 3) examines this distinction more closely. At its core is an argument by negation: when and where do our individuals, institutions, and ideologies intersect? And what dissonance or tension ensues?

In this passage, Brinton emphasizes that a revolution involves more than merely a change in power, perhaps brought about through electoral means, or even an unexpected shift in policies or those in power. For political change to be "revolutionary," Brinton argues that it must involve violence and a sudden change in those holding power. Presumably those new to power will not be merely a replacement of one clique of persons for another, but new *types* of persons, perhaps from a different social strata or political ideology. In any case, Brinton captures and has likely influenced our Definition of revolution: a violent change in the type of government and/or social order.

Brinton's work was originally published in 1938, so he limits his analysis primarily to European (and American) revolutions. If such a work were published today, it would likely include revolutions in Asia and Africa, such as those in China (1949) and Iran (1979). The leader of the Chinese Communist Revolution, Mao Zedong, offered a well-known and much blunter definition of revolution: "A revolution is not a dinner party, or writing an essay, or painting a picture, or doing embroidery; it cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another." Even accounting for the pugnacious tone, especially as Mao Zedong's Definition focuses on what a revolution is not, Mao's perspective of revolution coincides largely with Brinton's Definition. We can chalk up the difference in tone by noting the power of *audience* in influencing our message: **1)** Mao was writing to motivate his followers toward eliminating their adversaries (the Kuomintang Nationalist Party) and **2)** Brinton wrote as a historian in a secondary source focused on dispassionate analysis. [The next chapter on the Common Topic of Circumstance delves into audience more fully.]

Yet they both agree that any revolution worthy of the name entails violence. But is that really the case? Can a revolution be effected with non-violence and moral means? Precedents exist in the twentieth century for (mostly) non-violent yet revolutionary changes in political regimes: India's independence movement, the U.S. Civil Rights movement of the 1950s and 1960s, and the overthrow of communism in 1989–1990 across Eastern Europe. Mahatma Gandhi, who helped lead the Indian struggle, famously relied on non-violent resistance to British authority. At his 1922 trial for sedition by the British government, Gandhi offered a different account of revolution:

HISTORICAL ANNOTATIONS

RHETORICAL ANNOTATIONS

Mahatma Gandhi, Indian nationalist and activist, speech at his trial, 1922

Notice how Gandhi establishes ethos with his audience (fellow Indians and perhaps the world watching events) by stating his "article of faith." He does this despite the percolating anger of his countrymen that he senses behind him.

Non-violence is the first article of my faith. It is also the last article of my creed. But I had to make my choice. I had either to submit to a system which I considered had done an irreparable harm to my country, or incur the risk of the mad fury of my people bursting forth when they understood the truth from my lips. I know that my people have sometimes gone mad. I am deeply sorry for it and I am, therefore, here to submit not to a light penalty but to the highest penalty. I do not ask for mercy. I do not plead any extenuating act. I am here, therefore, to invite and cheerfully submit to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is a deliberate crime, and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen. The only course open to you, the Judge, is, as I am going to say in my statement, either to resign your post, or inflict on me the severest penalty if you believe that the system and law you are assisting to administer are good for the people. I do not expect that kind of conversion. But by the time I have finished with my statement you will have a glimpse of what is raging within my breast to run this maddest risk which a sane man can run.

A hallmark of non-violent resistance involves accepting the consequences of one's actions, even, and perhaps especially, when visited upon the revolutionaries by an unjust law and government. For Gandhi, his punishment serves to highlight the injustice of British rule in India. Much like King's Letter from the Birmingham Jail.

One verbal signpost for Definitions is the "to be" verb. When Gandhi posits whether the laws ARE good for the people, he stakes the claim that laws SHOULD be good for people. Or, by stating that "non-co-operation with evil IS as much a duty as co-operation with good," he equates two distinct approaches towards non-violence.

...I believe that I have rendered a service to India and England by showing in non-co-operation the way out of the unnatural state in which both are living. In

Gandhi concludes with pathos, a moving statement of how non-cooperation with injustice or evil need not rely on the same tactics of the oppressor. In a nutshell, Gandhi aims for the moral high ground, indicating that his audience is the world, and perhaps posterity.

> my opinion, non-co-operation with evil is as much a duty as is co-operation with good. But in the past, non-co-operation has been deliberately expressed in violence to the evil-doer. I am endeavoring to show to my countrymen that violent non-co-operation only multiplies evil, and that as evil can only be sustained by violence, withdrawal of support of evil requires complete abstention from violence. Non-violence implies voluntary submission to the penalty for non-co-operation with evil. I am here, therefore, to invite and submit cheerfully to the highest penalty that can be inflicted upon me for what in law is deliberate crime, and what appears to me to be the highest duty of a citizen.

APPLICATION AND CONVERSATION 1.7

After reading this passage, summarize the differences between Mao Zedong's and Mahatma Gandhi's views on revolution. In your response, analyze the tone of each source in connection to its intended audience and purpose.

Write your response in a separate document. Share your insights with your partner once they've drafted their own response.

Gandhi clearly aims at a revolutionary outcome: the overthrow of British authority on the Indian subcontinent (which includes present-day Pakistan and Bangladesh). However, his language, tone, and purpose (in the spirit of AP source analysis), especially in contrast with Mao, embraces morality and responsibility, eschewing violence and vengeance, even against injustice. Your writing on the topic will be deepened by a more explicit attention to the meaning of revolution. Consider the following prompt:

> ***Evaluate the effectiveness of violence in achieving political change by discussing any two revolutions from world history after 1750.***

Similar to the previous prompts, you are invited to step back and define the term prior to your argument. Making your Definition explicit will provide your essay with direction and set it up for the introduction of complexity, by modifying and extending your argument. When you "evaluate," you make an informed judgment, and by defining what you mean by "revolution," your argument becomes more effective.

AP® TIP

In the Document-Based Question (DBQ) for each history course, you will be asked to engage in "source analysis" for two documents, though you may earn the complexity point for doing so with four or more documents. This requires that you consider one or more of the following in treating the source: **1)** how its historical context or situation influenced the content, **2)** how the intended audience or **3)** purpose influenced the tone or content, and **4)** how the point of view (based on the identity of the speaker or author) influenced the perspective of the source, perhaps including its bias or credibility.

APPLICATION & CONVERSATION 1.8

Create an outline in response to the prompt, with a focus on the Definition of "revolution."

Write your response in a separate document. Share your insights with your partner once they've drafted their own response.

TEMPLATES

The following templates, some of which are modeled by the authors of the excerpts in this chapter, provide you with language to help incorporate definitional arguments.

Template 1.A

Templates that introduce a dominant perspective, often by introducing patterns or past precedents:

- Traditionally, ideas about _____ were _____.
- Many have often considered the definition of **X** to be _____.
- The reason why _____ definition has been so enduring is _____.

Author Model: Crane Brinton

> We think of the great overturns in previously stable political societies in the past—the English Revolution of the 1640s and its sequel in 1688, the American Revolution, the French Revolution and its nineteenth-century sequels, the Russian Revolution of 1917 and its twentieth-century sequels; or we think of nationalist revolutions like the twentieth-century revolutions in Ireland and Algeria. We may also think of violence and terror, purges and guillotines.

From [**historical event #1**], to [**#2**], to [**#3**], the definition of _____ has been _____.

Template 1.B

Templates that introduce a new perspective, or an extension:

- Contrary to popular belief, _____ carries another meaning:
- A review of history, especially in light of _____, suggests a new definition for _____:
- While [**stakeholder #1**] may define **X** as _____, what [**stakeholder #2**] also incorporates is _____.

Author Model: Frederick Jackson Turner

> Thus American development has exhibited not merely advance along a single line, but a return to primitive conditions on a continually advancing frontier line, and a new development for that area.

Thus, **X** not only includes _____, but also _____.

With these examples in mind, we turn back to the first prompt:

> ***Evaluate the role of the frontier in promoting equality in the period 1846–1890.***

APPLICATION & CONVERSATION 1.9

If you have taken a course in U.S. History, we invite you to write a response, perhaps under timed circumstances of 40–45 minutes, to this question.

Write your response in a separate document. When finished, you are invited to compare your response to the one below. Share your insights with your partner once they've drafted their own response.

SAMPLE STUDENT ESSAY

> ***Evaluate the role of the frontier in promoting equality in the period 1846–1890.***

We have added annotations to the student sample essay below and—for those of you taking an AP® History course—noted the ways in which the response earned points on the Long Essay Question (LEQ) rubric.

HISTORICAL ANNOTATIONS

RHETORICAL ANNOTATIONS

Sample Student Essay for Chapter 1

American history has been defined by expansion, first across the open frontier and then overseas, with the gaining of colonies. Politicians justified this expansion with the idea of "Manifest Destiny," the right of white Americans to conquer and "civilize" the lands under the control of Mexicans and Indians. Frederick Jackson Turner viewed the frontier in the traditional way: as a line moving west that carried with it civilization into unsettled and primitive lands. Yet, there are other ways of looking at the frontier. Many would argue that the frontier is a space of interaction, between many different groups, including African-Americans, women, Indians, and Mexicans. This interaction was not one of equality, however. The frontier only provided equality for those associated with the Manifest Destiny idea, while those who already settled this "virgin territory" lost land and status.

In several sentences, the response provides ample historical context by specific references to developments in U.S. History, such as Manifest Destiny, Turner, and various social groups affected. **+1 point for Contextualization**

The response establishes a complex line of argument by noting groups who both gained in equality and those left behind by the process of settlement. **+1 point for Thesis**

This move introduces a new perspective.

Note the use of negation here.

The issue of westward expansion dominated American politics in the first half of the nineteenth century, especially after the Louisiana Purchase. Settlers moved west in search of lands for agriculture, fur trading, and ranching. Some groups, like the Mormons, moved west after facing religious persecution. Soon after settlers came railroads and new territories that aimed to become states. This issue of new states became a major source of conflict after the Mexican-American War added huge swaths of new territory to the United States. Many southerners saw these new lands as ideal places for the extension of slave labor and the production of cotton, as happened in states like Texas and Arkansas. Of course, this was a negative for African Americans. However, after the Civil War, many African Americans served as "Buffalo Soldiers" in the west, which helped convince the government to give them the vote with the 15th Amendment. Also, since women were scarce on the frontier, many territories, like Wyoming, granted women the vote long before it became a national law. Therefore, it's clear that many groups, like persecuted religions, women, and African Americans gained a degree of equality by moving to the frontier.

Not all groups achieved equality on the frontier. The interaction of cultures in the west actually worked against the peoples who already lived there. The white man's version of the frontier as a lawless and unsettled space ignored that much of the west had been occupied by the Native Americans for thousands of years and Mexicans (Spanish) for hundreds of years. Many saw the Mexican-American War, begun by President Polk, as a land-grab. In fact, Abraham Lincoln demanded as a Congressman that Polk specify where U.S. troops had supposedly been attacked by the Mexican Army in his "Spot Resolutions." Few paid attention, as this war was very popular, since it added so much territory to the U.S. It did provoke more heated debates about slavery; for example, the Wilmot Proviso attempted to prohibit the spread of slavery into these new territories. But this bill never passed the Senate, and other acts, like Kansas-Nebraska, just raised the stakes leading up to the Civil War. The spread of slavery into the west certainly

Both body paragraphs provide significant historical content and demonstrate mastery of chronology. The sample discusses numerous examples connecting the frontier to religious groups, the Civil War, women's suffrage, Indian removal, and African Americans. Further, the response continues with its line of argument in how it distinguishes diverging impacts of westward expansion on these groups. **+2 points for evidence; +1 point for addressing reasoning process of CCOT**

The bulk of the Definition rests with well-chosen examples in these body paragraphs.

didn't help African Americans, nor did it enhance the equality of Indians and Mexicans. Mexico lost much of its territory to the United States, which left Native Americans as the next victims. With railroads and the discovery of gold and silver in the west (like the Black Hills in South Dakota), white Americans poured into these lands. The U.S. government broke treaty after treaty promising to set aside and protect Indian land. In addition, the U.S. army engaged in massacres, like at Sand Creek and Wounded Knee. Even though Custer and his cavalry were killed at Little Big Horn, this victory only delayed the inevitable: the loss of all Indian independence. Clearly, the frontier was not a place of equality for those groups on the "wrong side of the line ."

As Turner noted, the American frontier "closed" as of the 1890 Census, which is right around when Geronimo, the leader of the Apaches, was captured. Though Turner's thesis ignores the idea of cultural interaction, it also neglects the important role of the environment and ecological impact in the settling of the west. The U.S. government enacted laws that made land cheap to settle, as long as those peoples improved it by setting up farms or ranches. Also, railroads and mining companies were given easy if not free access to land for it to be exploited for the development of the economy and linking up the U.S. coast-to-coast. Though these policies helped make the United States a world leader, they also created environmental problems in the west that still exist today, such as chemical contamination, water shortages, and desertification. Some groups did gain equality and improved status because they contributed to this progress of settlement; however, those groups who interacted with the land in different ways certainly did not benefit.

The response effectively returns to the notion of the frontier and offers multiple Definitions of the concept, both Turner's and the New Western History, albeit implicitly. In addition, the essay effectively modifies and extends its argument by connecting the topic to an additional theme, Geography and the Environment, that was not the basis of the prompt. **+1 point for Complexity** (which was likely already earned for applying four or more examples to the argument)

Note how the writer builds to the thesis; the introduction frames the Definition and then reinforces the Definition with a clear distinction from older to newer perspectives.

By acknowledging the ongoing tension as a result of the land policies, the writer contextualizes the argument. The Definition is supported by contemporary examples.