The issue of territorial expansion sparked considerable debate in the period 1800–1855.

Analyze this debate and evaluate the influence of both supporters and opponents of territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy.

Use the documents and your knowledge of the years 1800–1855 in your answer.

**The 8–9 Essay**
- Articulates a clear, well-constructed thesis that analyzes the debate and evaluates the influence of both supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- Effectively employs a substantial number of documents to analyze the debate and evaluate the influence of supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- Provides substantial, relevant outside information taken from the period 1800 to 1855 to analyze the debate and evaluate the influence of supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy.
- Evaluates the ways in which supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion shaped federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- Is well organized and well written.
- May contain minor errors.

**The 5–7 Essay**
- Contains a thesis, which may be partially developed, analyzing the debate and evaluating the influence of both supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- Satisfactorily employs an ample number of documents to analyze the debate and evaluate the influence of supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- Provides ample, relevant outside information from the period 1800 to 1855 to analyze the debate and evaluate the influence of supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy.
- Addresses the ways in which supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion shaped federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- May present an imbalanced treatment of the supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion between 1800 and 1855, or looks only in passing at the ways in which federal government policy on expansion was shaped, or presents imbalanced treatment of the period involved.
- Has acceptable organization and writing.
- May contain errors that do not seriously detract from the essay.

**The 2–4 Essay**
- Presents a thesis that may be simplistic, confused or undeveloped in analyzing the debate and evaluating the influence of both supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy between 1800 and 1855, or simply restates the question.
- Uses few documents concerning the debate and influence of supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
Question 1 — Document-Based Question (continued)

- Includes little or no relevant outside information from the period 1800 to 1855 to analyze the debate and the influence of supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion in shaping federal government policy.
- Has little analysis or does not address the ways in which supporters and opponents of U.S. territorial expansion shaped federal government policy between 1800 and 1855.
- May treat only one part of the question.
- May be poorly organized or poorly written, or both.
- May contain major errors.

The 0–1 Essay
- Lacks a thesis or simply restates the question.
- Refers to few, if any, of the documents or uses them inappropriately.
- Includes no relevant outside information from the period 1800 to 1855.
- Contains no analysis.
- Is poorly organized or poorly written, or both.
- May contain numerous errors, both major and minor.

The — Essay
- Is completely off topic or blank.
### Question 1 — Potential Outside Information

#### People
- Adams, John Quincy
- Austin, Stephen
- Black Hawk
- Bonaparte, Napoleon
- Bowie, Jim
- Bridger, Jim
- Buchanan, James
- Burr, Aaron
- Cass, Lewis
- Clay, Henry
- Crockett, Davy
- Decatur, Stephen
- Douglas, Stephen
- du Pont de Nemours, Pierre Samuel
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo
- Fillmore, Millard
- Frémont, John C.
- Gaines, George
- Harkins, Thomas
- Harrison, William Henry
- Houston, Sam
- Hull, William
- Jackson, Andrew
- Jefferson, Thomas
- Kearny, Stephen
- Key, Francis Scott
- Lafitte, Jean
- Lincoln, Abraham
- Livingston, Robert
- L’Ouverture, Toussaint
- Lowell, Robert
- Madison, Dolley
- Madison, James
- Marcy, William
- Marshall, John
- Mason, John Y.
- Monroe, John
- Osceola
- O’Sullivan, John L.
- Perry, Oliver
- Pickering, Timothy
- Pierce, Franklin
- Polk, James K.
- Ross, John
- Santa Anna
- Scott, Winfield
- Sequoya
- Smith, Jedediah
- Soulé, Pierre
- Talleyrand
- Taylor, Zachary
- Tecumseh
- Tenskwatawa
- Travis, William
- Trist, Nicholas
- Tyler, John
- Van Buren, Martin
- Walker, William
- Whitman, Marcus

#### Groups
- Anglo-Saxons
- Democrat-Republicans
- Republican Party
- Cherokee
- Five Civilized Tribes
- Sauk
- Chickasaw
- Iroquois
- War Hawks
- Choctaw
- John Jacob Astor Co.
- Whig Party
- Creek
- nonresistants
- Northern Confederacy
- Democratic Party

#### Places
- Alamo
- Lake Ontario
- Oregon Country
- Britain
- Lone Star Republic
- Oregon Trail
- California
- Louisiana Territory
- Overland Trail
- Cuba
- Mexican Cession
- Red River Basin
- Everglades
- Mexico
- Republic of Texas
- Florida (East and West)
- Michigan
- Rio Grande
- Fort McHenry
- Mississippi River
- Rocky Mountains
- France
- Mobile, Alabama
- Rupert’s Land
- Georgia
- Nicaragua
- Sabine Free State
- Gulf of Mexico
- North West Territory
- Texas
- Indian Country/Territory
- Nueces River
- Tristan da Cunha
- Lake Champlain
- Oklahoma

#### Events
- Adams–Onís Treaty
- Battle of Horseshoe Bend
- Battle of Plattsburgh
- Anglo-American Convention
- Battle of Monterrey
- Battle of Queenstown Heights
- Battle of Buena Vista
- Battle of New Orleans
- Battle of San Jacinto

© 2010 The College Board.
Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.com.
Question 1 — Potential Outside Information (continued)

Battle of the Thames  
Battle of Vera Cruz  
Bear Flag Revolt  
Black Warrior affair  
burning of Washington  
Chesapeake affair  
Cherokee Nation v. Georgia  
Compromise of 1850  
Creek War of 1836  
Democratic Review  
election of 1844  
Embargo Act of 1807  
filibustering  
Gadsden Purchase  
Georgia Gold Rush  
Haitian Revolution  
HMS Guerriere  
Indian Removal Act of 1830  
Kansas–Nebraska Act  
Lewis and Clark expedition  
Little Belt affair  
Louisiana Purchase  
Macon's Bill No. 2  
Mexican Cession  
Mr. Madison's War  
Mr. Polk's War  
Napoleonic Wars  
Non-Intercourse Act  
Old Ironsides  
Oregon Treaty of 1846  
Pinckney's Treaty  
sacking of York  
Second War for American Independence  
Seminole Wars  
Texas annexation  
Texas Revolution  
Trail of Tears  
Transcontinental Treaty  
Treaty of Cusseta  
Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek  
Treaty of 1818  
Treaty of Fort Jackson  
Treaty of Ghent  
Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo  
Treaty of Indian Springs  
Treaty of New Echota  
Treaty of Paris  
Treaty of San Ildefonso  
Treat of Velasco  
USS Constitution  
War of 1812  
Webster–Ashburton Treaty  
Wilmot Proviso  
Worcester v. Georgia

Concepts/Policies/Practices

Africanization  
American Empire  
American exceptionalism  
Article I, Section 8  
Bleeding Kansas  
continentalism  
"Don't give up the ship"  
empire for liberty  
"Fifty-four Forty or Fight!"  
impressments  
loose construction  
Manifest Destiny  
Monroe Doctrine  
New Orleans  
Orders in Council  
pacifism  
privateering  
providence  
right of deposit  
Rule of 1756  
spot resolutions  
states' rights  
strict construction  
slave power  
"The Star-Spangled Banner"  
Transcendentalism  
White House  
Young America Movement
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Document A

Source: Congressional debate, October 1803.

James Elliot, Federalist, Vermont:

The Constitution is silent on the subject of the acquisition of territory. By the treaty we acquire territory; therefore the treaty is unconstitutional.

Samuel Thatcher, Federalist, Massachusetts:

This acquisition of distant territory will involve the necessity of a considerable standing army, so justly an object of terror. Do gentlemen flatter themselves that by purchasing Louisiana, we are invulnerable? No, sir; Spain will still border on our southern frontier, and so long as Spain occupies that country we are not secure from the attempts of another nation more warlike and ambitious.

William Plumer, Federalist, New Hampshire:

Admit this western world into the union, and you destroy with a single operation the whole weight and importance of the eastern states.

Document Information

- Three northeastern members of the Federalist Party had grave doubts about the Louisiana Purchase in 1803.
- These doubts stemmed from the observation that the federal Constitution does not authorize territorial acquisition, from a belief that the United States was no safer for having acquired this large territory, and from a fear that eastern states would become less important as the country expanded to the West.
- The United States had just purchased Louisiana in 1803.
- The U.S. Constitution does not mention ways in which the federal government may acquire territory.
- A standing army represented a threat.

Document Inferences

- The opponents of early American expansion were Federalists.
- Opposition to expansion rested on several premises, including constitutional considerations, national security and self-interest.
- Based on the revolutionary experience of the United States, there was good reason to oppose a standing army.

Potential Outside Information

<p>| Article I, Section 8 | Bonaparte, Napoleon | Burr, Aaron | Democrat-Republicans | du Pont de Nemours, Pierre | Duval, Samuel | empire for liberty | France | Gulf of Mexico | Haitian Revolution | Jefferson, Thomas | Lewis and Clark expedition | Livingston, Robert | L'Ouverture, Toussaint | Mississippi River | Monroe, James | New Orleans |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Northern Confederacy</th>
<th>right of deposit</th>
<th>states’ rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pickering, Timothy</td>
<td>Rocky Mountains</td>
<td>strict construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinckney’s Treaty</td>
<td>Rupert’s Land</td>
<td>Talleyrand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party</td>
<td>Sauk</td>
<td>Treaty of San Ildefonso</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Document Information
- The U.S. House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly for war on June 4, 1812.
- More than two-thirds of the House of Representatives voted for war on June 4, 1812, with most of the supporters coming from the South and West and most opponents coming from the Northeast, along with some from Virginia and Maryland.
• All the congressmen from Pennsylvania, Georgia and South Carolina and from west of the Appalachian Mountains (Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee) voted for war.

Document Inferences
• In this “Second War for Independence,” the United States went to war with Britain in 1812, chiefly to force the British out of U.S. territory and thus clear the way for American expansion.
• The British had never respected American sovereignty over the area all the way to the Mississippi River, which was called for in the Treaty of Paris that ended the American Revolution.

Potential Outside Information
Battle of Horseshoe Bend Hull, William
Battle of New Orleans impressment
Battle of Plattsburgh Iroquois
Battle of Queenstown Heights Jackson, Andrew
Battle of the Thames Key, Francis Scott
burning of Washington Lafitte, Jean
Calhoun, John C. Lake Champlain
Chesapeake affair Lake Ontario
Cherokee Little Belt affair
Choctaw Liverpool, Lord
Clay, Henry Macon’s Bill No. 2
Creek Madison, Dolley
Creek Madison, James
Decatur, Stephen Mobile, Alabama
“Don’t give up the ship” Monroe, James
Embargo Act of 1807 Mr. Madison’s War
Era of Good Feelings Napoleonic Wars
Fort McHenry Non-Intercourse Act
Harrison, William Henry Northwest Territory
HMS Guerriere

Old Ironsides
Orders in Council
Perry, Oliver
Pinckney’s Treaty
privateering
Rule of 1756
sacking of York
Sauk
Scott, Winfield
Second War for American Independence
Tecumseh
Tenskwatawa
“The Star-Spangled Banner”
Treaty of Ghent
USS Constitution
War Hawks
White House
Document C

Source: Lewis Cass, in Documents and Proceedings Relating to the Formation and Progress of a Board in the City of New York, for the Emigration, Preservation, and Improvement of the Aborigines of America, 1829.

Existing for two centuries in contact with a civilized people, [the Cherokees] have resisted, and successfully too, every effort to meliorate [improve] their situation, or to introduce among them the most common arts of life. Their moral and their intellectual condition have been equally stationary. And in the whole circle of their existence, it would be difficult to point to a single advantage which they have derived from their acquaintance with the Europeans. All this is without a parallel in the history of the world. That it is not to be attributed to the indifference or neglect of the whites, we have already shown. There must then be an inherent difficulty, arising from the institutions, character, and condition of the Indians themselves.

Document Information

- In an 1829 report on American aborigines, Lewis Cass expressed a belief that the Cherokee Nation had made no progress in improving its society despite 200 years of “contact with a civilized people.”
- This lack of improvement, Cass maintained, was the direct result of the Cherokee refusal to change and was the first such instance in world history in which a group considered to be inferior did not benefit from associating with a civilization considered to be more advanced.
- Cass argued that this lack of improvement could not be laid at the feet of Europeans but must be attributed to an inherently inferior civilization. White Americans regarded native peoples, including the Cherokee, as inferior and blamed them for their inferior position because they had not benefited from close contact with Europeans.

Document Inferences

- The author of this document, Lewis Cass, was a brigadier general in the War of 1812, a longtime governor of the Michigan Territory and negotiator of the Treaty of Fort Miegs with Indian tribes.
- As Andrew Jackson’s secretary of war, Cass was a central figure in the formulation and implementation of Indian removal. Cass would also support Texas annexation.
- In addition, Americans had a long history of mistreating American Indians.

Potential Outside Information

American Indian leaders  Five Civilized Tribes  Oklahoma
Cherokee Nation v. Georgia  Georgia  Seminole Wars
Chickasaw  Jackson, Andrew  Trail of Tears
Choctaw  Manifest Destiny  Worcester v. Georgia
Democratic Party  Marshall, John
Document Information

- In the 1830s six American Indian nations — the Cherokee, Chickasaw, Choctaw, Creek, Sac and Fox, and Seminole — were removed by seven routes over land and sea from the area alongside or east of the Mississippi to a region west of the state of Missouri and the Arkansas Territory.

Document Inferences

- As part of its anti-Indian and expansionist policy, the U.S. government, under presidents Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, forcibly relocated the Five Civilized Tribes from their ancestral homes in the American Southeast and the Sac and Fox from an area in and around Illinois to assigned reservations east of the Mississippi River, in what are present-day Kansas and Oklahoma.
Document D (continued)

- Jacksonian Democracy did not apply to these peoples.
- The removal began with the Choctaw in 1831, which became the model for the subsequent removals, including the Seminole in 1832, the Creek in 1834, the Chickasaw in 1837 and the Cherokee in 1838.
- Because of exposure, disease and starvation, this “Trail Where They Cried,” also called the “Trail of Tears,” resulted in the deaths of thousands of Cherokee out of the 15,000 who were moved. By 1837, 46,000 Native Americans had been removed from their homelands, which opened 25 million acres for white settlement.

Potential Outside Information

Black Hawk
Cass, Lewis (secretary of war)
Cherokee Nation v. Georgia (1831) (Marshall Court ruled that the Cherokee were not a sovereign, independent nation and therefore refused to hear the case)
Creek War of 1836
Everglades
Five Civilized Tribes
Gaines, George (managed the Choctaw removal)
Georgia Gold Rush
Harkins, Thomas (Nitikechi) (said removal was a “trail of tears and death”)
Indian Country/Territory
Indian Removal Act of 1830
Marshall, John
Osceola
Ross, John (Gwisguwi) (first and only elected chief of the Cherokee)
Scott, Winfield
Seminole Wars
Sequoya
Trail of Tears (Cherokee, 1838)
Treaty of Cussetta (divided Creek land into individual allotments, which led to fraud and violence, 1832)
Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek (Choctaw accepted removal if some could remain behind, 1831)
Treaty of Fort Jackson (Creek give up most of the remaining land in Georgia, 1814)
Treaty of Ghent (restored sovereignty to Indians and their nations, 1815)
Treaty of Indian Springs (Creek gave up remaining land in Georgia, 1825)
Treaty of New Echota (an agreement with a Creek faction that exchanged Creek land in the East for land past the Mississippi River, 1836)
Martin Van Buren
Worcester v. Georgia (1832) (Marshall Court ruled that Georgia could not impose laws in Cherokee territory because only the national government has the authority in American Indian affairs)
Document Information

- An eagle is superimposed on an 1833 map of the United States, extending from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rocky Mountains and from the Great Lakes to Florida.

Document Inferences

- The United States rightly owns/controls the region from the Atlantic Ocean to the Rocky Mountains, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico.

Potential Outside Information

- Adams, John Quincy
- American Empire
- American exceptionalism
- Anglo-American Convention
- Anglo-Saxons
- Cass, Lewis
- continentalism
- Democratic Party

Democratic Review
“Fifty-four Forty or Fight!”
Louisiana Territory
Manifest Destiny
Monroe Doctrine
O’Sullivan, John L.
Oregon Treaty of 1846
Polk, James K.

providence
Republic of Texas
Texas annexation
Transcontinental Treaty
Treaty of 1818
Whig Party
Young America Movement
Source: Thomas Hart Benton, speech in the United States Senate, 1844.

[T]he settlers in Oregon will also recover and open for us the North American road to India! This road lies through the South Pass, and the mouth of the Oregon; and as soon as the settlements are made, our portion of the North American continent will immediately commence its Asiatic trade on this new and national route.

Document Information
- Thomas Hart Benton made a speech to the U.S. Senate in 1844 in which he predicted that American settlers in Oregon would open trade with Asia.

Document Inferences
- As senator from Missouri, Thomas Hart Benton was an architect and champion of westward expansion of the United States, a cause that became known as Manifest Destiny.
- Among his causes, Benton advocated the displacement of Native Americans in favor of European settlers, exploration of the West, especially by his son-in-law John C. Frémont, and government construction of the transcontinental railway and the telegraph.
- Benton favored Texas annexation (but not the Mexican War) and the abrogation of the Adams–Onís Treaty, which relinquished claims to Texas by the United States.

Potential Outside Information
- Bridger, Jim
- Democratic Party
- election of 1844
- John Jacob Astor Co.
- Manifest Destiny
- Oregon Trail
- Overland Trail
- Rocky Mountains
- Smith, Jedediah
- Whitman, Marcus
Document G

Source: Letter from Andrew Jackson to Moses Dawson, published in *Niles’ National Register*, 1844.

If there be patriotism in the effort to increase the wealth and happiness of all classes in our society—to diffuse the blessings of equal laws, and a just government . . . if there be love in the spirit which finds in this free land of ours the means to spread the light of the Gospel, and to teach fallen man throughout the world how he may recover his right to civil and religious liberty—it seems to me that all this patriotism—all this philanthropy—all this religion—appeals to us in favor of the addition of Texas to our Union.

Document Information
- Andrew Jackson wrote a letter to Moses Dawson that appeared in *Niles’ National Register* in 1844.

Document Inferences
- Just before matters concerning the status of Texas came to a head, former president Andrew Jackson wrote to Moses Dawson, a well-known Cincinnati editor, that Texas annexation would be a boon in a variety of ways.

Potential Outside Information
- Alamo
- Austin, Stephen
- Battle of San Jacinto
- Bowie, Jim
- Crockett, Davy
- Houston, Sam
- Lone Star Republic
- Polk, James K.
- Republic of Texas
- Santa Anna
- Taylor, Zachary
- Texas Revolution
- Travis, William
- Treaty of Velasco
- Tyler, John
- Whig Party
Document H

Source: John C. Calhoun, address to Congress on Mexico, 1848.

We are anxious to force free government on all; and I see that it has been urged in a very respectable quarter, that it is the mission of this country to spread civil and religious liberty over the entire world, and especially over this continent. It is a great mistake. None but people advanced to a very high state of moral and intellectual improvement are capable, in a civilized state, of maintaining free government; and amongst those who are so purified, very few, indeed, have had the good fortune of forming a constitution capable of endurance.

Document Information

- In an address to Congress in 1848, Senator John C. Calhoun criticized the contention of respectable people that every nation could sustain democratic government.
- Not every people, he maintained, possessed sufficient development in moral and intellectual terms to support political liberty.

Document Inferences

- Senator John C. Calhoun of South Carolina, a former War Hawk before the War of 1812 and later a secretary of state and vice president, questioned the wisdom of the Mexican War and abstained when the authorization vote for war came.
- After the United States thrashed Mexico and debated the prospect of extending its border all the way to Guatemala, Calhoun denounced the idea as fundamentally changing the character of American society.
- The acquisition of Mexico would compel the United States to adopt what Calhoun was convinced was a doomed experiment — a truly multiracial society of the kind that had allegedly dragged down the Spanish in Latin America.
- Calhoun believed that some peoples, especially Mexicans, were incapable of replicating the American experiment in liberty.
- Calhoun noted that the United States had either pushed Indian nations into the wilderness or allowed them separate spheres.
- Better, Calhoun thought, to be satisfied with acquiring a largely uninhabited block of land called the Mexican Cession, which is exactly what Congress agreed to in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo.

Potential Outside Information

Adams, John Quincy  Kearny, Stephen  Scott, Winfield
Battle of Buena Vista  Lincoln, Abraham  spot resolutions
Battle of Monterrey  Lowell, Robert  Taylor, Zachary
Battle of Vera Cruz  Mexican Cession  Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo
Bear Flag Revolt  Mr. Polk’s War  Trist, Nicholas
Compromise of 1850  Nicaragua  Walker, William
Democratic Party  Nueces River  Wilmot, David
filibustering  Rio Grande  Wilmot Proviso

The government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it. Witness the present Mexican War, the work of comparatively a few individuals using the standing government as their tool; for, in the outset, the people would not have consented to this measure.

**Document Information**
- In *Civil Disobedience*, which was written in 1849, Henry David Thoreau warned of governmental abuse in the absence of a functioning democracy, mentioning as a prime example the unpopular Mexican War.

**Document Inferences**
- This classic essay against governmental power, which was originally entitled *Resistance to Civil Government*, reflected transcendentalist Henry David Thoreau’s opposition to military force and to slavery, both of which were issues in the Mexican War that the United States had prosecuted in the late 1840s.
- When a tax collector demanded that Thoreau pay his poll tax, Thoreau refused because, he noted, taxes finance injustice, including what he regarded as America’s unprovoked war with Mexico to enable slave expansion.
- He was briefly jailed for his antitax stance until his aunt bailed him out.

**Potential Outside Information**
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo
- Lincoln, Abraham
- Mr. Polk’s War
- nonresistants
- pacifists
- spot resolutions
- transcendentalists
- Whig Party
- Wilmot Proviso
Source: Ostend Manifesto, 1854.

By every law, human and divine, we shall be justified in wresting [Cuba] from Spain if we possess the power; and this upon the very same principle that would justify an individual in tearing down the burning house of his neighbor if there were no other means of preventing the flames from destroying his own home. Under such circumstances we ought neither to count the cost nor regard the odds which Spain might enlist against us.

Document Information
- According to the Ostend Manifesto, the United States had every right to take Cuba from Spain.

Document Inferences
- American expansionists, such as Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, had long coveted Cuba, particularly as a slave state, once California was made a free state under the Compromise of 1850.
- The only limitation worth considering was military might: Did the United States possess the raw power to force Spain out of Cuba?
- Although the Ostend Manifesto was never acted upon, the United States remained interested in Cuba, particularly after the American Civil War ended — an interest that ultimately led to Cuban independence.

Potential Outside Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adams, John Quincy</th>
<th>Fillmore, Millard</th>
<th>Polk, James K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africanization</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>slave power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Warrior affair</td>
<td>Kansas–Nebraska Act</td>
<td>Soulé, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleeding Kansas</td>
<td>Marcy, William</td>
<td>Taylor, Zachary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Britain</td>
<td>Mason, John Y.</td>
<td>Young America Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchanan, James</td>
<td>Monroe Doctrine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filibustering</td>
<td>Pierce, Franklin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 1 — Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Louisiana Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Ohio statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>West Florida</td>
<td>Annexed by United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>Tristan da Cunha</td>
<td>Claimed by United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Southern Alabama</td>
<td>Annexed by United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>British North America</td>
<td>War of 1812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1814</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Treaty of Fort Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1815</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Treaty of Ghent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>Mississippi statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1817</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Treaty of Fort Miegs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Dakotas and Minnesota</td>
<td>Ceded by Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Northern Maine</td>
<td>Ceded by Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Red River Basin</td>
<td>Treaty with Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1818</td>
<td>Oregon Country</td>
<td>Anglo-American Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>Alabama statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Adams–Onís Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1819</td>
<td>Western Louisiana</td>
<td>Ceded by Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1821</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>Missouri Compromise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1825</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Treaty of Indian Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Southeastern United States</td>
<td>Indian Removal Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830s</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>American Indian removal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Choctaw land</td>
<td>Treaty of Dancing Rabbit Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1831</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td><em>Cherokee Nation v. Georgia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td><em>Worcester v. Georgia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1832</td>
<td>Alabama and Georgia</td>
<td>Treaty of Cusseta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Treaty of New Echota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Texas Revolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Michigan statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>Trail of Tears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>United States–Canada border</td>
<td>Webster–Ashburton Treaty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Texas annexation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Florida statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Iowa statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Great Lakes</td>
<td>Treaty with Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Annexed by United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>San Juan Islands</td>
<td>Jointly claimed by United States and Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846–1848</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mexican War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Mexican Cession</td>
<td>Treaty of Cahuenga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Mexican Cession</td>
<td>Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>Wisconsin statehood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>Mexican Cession</td>
<td><em>On Civil Disobedience</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Compromise of 1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1853</td>
<td>Southern Arizona</td>
<td>Gadsden Purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1854</td>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td>Ostend Manifesto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first half of the 19th century, the United States would expand from what was the original Thirteen Colonies that received successfully from England to include the entire breadth of the continent from Maine to California. Throughout this period, several significant accomplishments were made, including the Louisiana Purchase of 1803, the Compromise of 1820, the Mexican War, the Compromise of 1850, and most notably, the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Each of these, however, and more were met with numerous proponents as well as opponents to territorial expansion, each for different reasons. However, each and every debate for or against expansion eventually led to the United States government's actions, or lack thereof, and history has shaped the country as we know it today.

The Louisiana Purchase was made by Thomas Jefferson of the Democratic-Republican Party in 1803. Given the intense fear between the Federalists and the Jeffersonians, many Federalists, including Congressmen, were fundamentally against the purchase of massive amounts of land from a former potential enemy, France.

For example, James Elliot of Vermont stated that since "the Constitution is silent on the Subject of acquisition of territory... the treaty is unconstitutional." Ironically, the Federalists had already been vociferous interpreters of the Constitution, Jefferson himself had to get over his mindset of strict interpretation by the recognition that the mere $10 million he had to pay for the huge 828,000 potential land was a great bargain. Other Federalists, such as Samuel Thacher of Massachusetts and William Plumer of New Hampshire, agreed also that the Louisiana Purchase was interesting but for the United States, due to the threat of the Spanish in the South and because it would "destroy the whole weight and importance of the eastern states." However, despite numerous opponents, Jefferson was able to pass the Louisiana Purchase in Congress, as the benefits of acquiring an entire frontier gave many citizens hopes of westward expansion.

The War of 1812, although it ultimately ended with the Treaty of Ghent which effectively established status quo was also an outlet for northern and western hopes of westward expansion, as well as the acquisition of Canada, which the War Hawks, namely Henry Clay and John C. Calhoun, wanted. Where the War was popular in the South and in the West, it was met with distrust by New England under the Federalists. This led to the Hartford Convention of 1814, which led to the demise of the Federalist Party. Once again, they did not endorse expansionism, and in this case, the United States did not acquire any new land.
Circle the Section II question number you are answering on this page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mandatory</th>
<th>Part B — Circle one</th>
<th>Part C — Circle one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 or 3</td>
<td>4 or 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The War of 1812 led to several things in America’s eye, however. The Adams-Onis treaty in 1819 involved the acquisition of Florida from Spain. This time period also marked the humble beginnings of railroad development and the transcontinental railway. The Compromise of 1820, which made Missouri a slave state, was a turning point in American history. Missouri was admitted to the Union at 36° 30', making Missouri a slave state but creating Maine as a new free state. It also stated that no new territory above 36° 30' was to become a slave state.

As the Louisiana Purchase gave citizens the ability to move westward (except those without unconditional consent), Native Americans were harmed. This constant westward movement was supported by Frederick Jacquin Turner’s "Golden West," which stated that when one area became too crowded, American could always move west and find their own land. However, this caused an influx of American Indian removal to their own reservation in Oklahoma. This was supposedly justified by Lewis Cass, who stated that Native Americans had "resisted every effort of modification their condition. Their moral and intellectual condition entitles them equally to civilization. It would be difficult to point to a single advantage it has gained in their acquaintance with the Europeans." Andrew Jackson also combined Indian removal as a "first move to federal power, improvement in historical movement and territorial expansion. Despite this, since supported the idea of a"Native American council on land that would implement a historical movement and territorial expansion. Despite this, since supported the idea of a "Native American council on land that would implement a historical movement and territorial expansion.

When James Polk took office in 1844, he led a plan to achieve "Manifest Destiny," which stated that Americans had a divine responsibility to expand itself westward and take the native continent. In fact, before him, in 1844, Mexico before this, in 1833, an "Ohio map" of the United States showed a wish to expand itself west to include Oregon and Texas. In 1844, the election campaign for Polk was "50 40 or fight!" allowing itself to the acquisition of Oregon. In fact, Thomas Hart Benton said that acquiring Oregon would allow for trade with Asia. Eventually, the US did acquire Oregon, although at a "reasonable" border of 49°, as well as through the Whiskey Rebellion. Atkinson tested, a higher border for Maine.

Jonathan C. Estabrook, a key leader in 1812 who wanted to acquire Canada, was opposed to Manifest Destiny after the Treaty of Haldimand. Estabrook stated that he opposed civil and religious liberty all over the world.
is a great mistake." Despite this, the acquisition of the Mexican nation resumed, and settlement was granted to California at the end of the Mexican War. This was when the national debate over slavery was re-ignited. California would throw off the balance of the slave and free states yet again. Then the Compromise of 1850 ensued: Utah and New Mexico would become territories for popular sovereignty, and a Fugitive Slave Law would be enacted.

In the Kansas-Nebraska Act, similarly, the feud over slavery and territorial expansion would eventually lead to the Civil War.

All in all, from the Louisiana Purchase to the debate over slavery, the effects of the various debates over territorial expansion were numerous, and each has led to how the United States looks both literally and figuratively today.
Territorial expansion politized during the period of 1800-1855.

He perceived prosperity and affluence fueled expansion along with a belief of cultural superiority outweighed the opposition that proclaimed the injustice and unfairness of expansion, in shaping federal government policy. The greed of Northern politicians and desire for the growth economically of the U.S. fueled expansion.

Racism encouraged many to ignore other cultures and dominate because of claimed superiority. Those opposing expansion for both black or Native races were greatly outnumbered.

Politicians pushed for expansion to gain prosperity for America. With Great Britain still a threat in America, the Russians saw their opportunity to gain security from having Great Britain at their backs in Alaska in what would be an untenable place over considering their presence in Canada. So Russia offered Alaska at a low price to its ally, the U.S. Seward accepted and greatly expanded the U.S. obtaining much new land. James K. Polk, a U.S. president was also desperate for land and expansion. All he needed was an excuse to fight Mexico and he had his land. Luckily for him, Mexico attacked U.S. troops that had crossed the border. He appealed before congress and claimed that America had been shot on U.S. soil and all U.S. debts abandoned. It was shut and one sided and in the treaty gave small amount of money to Mexico in return for much of its territory, raw port at the U.S. border. His Texas had been encouraging Americans to come and settle when it was a part of Mexico and Americans came eventually succeeded from Mexico. Polk quickly benefited this territory because folk ran on a platform of expansion and the spend into the
Oregon Territory that was once controlled by Great Britain.\footnote{10} His supporters elected him. Wanting to focus on the Mexican-American War, like compromized but still gained much of the Oregon territory. Well before people at the beginning of the 1800s, Jefferson sent James Monroe to France to purchase the Louisiana Territory. He was seen as well as Napoleon's new world empire had been failed by Tooz's
caravans in a slave rebellion. Lewis and Clark, accompanied by Native guide Sacagawea, explored and documented this territory. Document E shows the American Eagle with its wings stretched over the new territories in 1813, its 50 years later in New England. Showing how New England politicians pushed for expansion. This is also supposed by Document B, showing the most considerable support for the war of 1812 was in New England.

Document F in 1844 is a speech leading the new trade opposition. Driven by settling Oregon and fugitives. Document G provides the generation of Texas and the benefits, wealth, and happiness that would result stated by Andrew Jackson in 1844. Document F is an excerpt from the Oxford Movement, only for the annexed of Cuba at war with Spain. These examples and documents support one thing. Neither politicians ignored Mexican and others had claims meant to gain earning wealth and prosperity for the nation by entry new territories. This was not the only tactic, many used racism and expansion to further control land. Andrew Jackson's Indian Removal Act forced the Cherokee to leave from their home in Georgia to the Cherokee Kansas territory. The Cherokees died on the trail of Tears. Jackson was a ruthless indian fighter and believed they
to be forced away from home to live so white Anglos could have the land. Similar to this, Metatekut and his tribe were forced to leave Oregon, their home, and move to Utah. The tribe of Paiute split on whether to resist or move when they Homestead Act was signed. The miners were seen as habitual and were forced to move because of this. Document H reflects this attitude in Mexican Colima state that Mexico will gain civil and personal liberty and says that here, but people opposed to any high moral and intellectual movement are cripple in a political state of military type govern. He implies that Mexicans are lesser and need to be treated taken over. Document J shows a report the miners being brutally cows, proving the lack of justice and personal security of whites in many areas. Racism and cultural superiority spread theespess at the US.

Those few who opposed expansion were greatly outweighed.

Document 5, leaves less depends the mission of expansion and the harm it has done to the natives. A side that had little influence.

Document J reflects that the Mexican war didn’t represent the will of the people but the government needed. Document 5 is an example of a success of this side. The opposition to the Ostend Manifesto used it to fail and never be used upon.

Government Federal policy was shaped by desire for economic gain and cultural superiority greatly in respect to expansion whereas those going expansion were few and far between having little virtues.
In the early to mid 19th century, debate sparked over the issue of territorial expansion. In this debate both supporters and opponents of expansion used legislature, common additudes, and knowledge to justify their views of territorial expansion in shaping government policy.

Many supporters of expansion used their beliefs of patriotism and needs to back their views on expansion policies. Many felt that "if there was patriotism in the effort to increase our land, it appeals to us in favor of expansion" (Doc. G). The idea of this statement is that if the nation feels a tie to the government, the spirit is one of love, so that those in the new territory can be helped, then we must expand to help those people. As well as patriotism, supporters used the idea that "the government will help us gain land." (Doc. D) Furthermore the supporters felt that if we possess the power to take on new land through government and the feelings of the nation, we may expand. The policies would state that remaining government officials Southerners would implement to "kick out"...
Indians from their lands, and move them westward for the farms in need of land for their tobacco industry. These actions are justified for they believe that they had the needs and power to do so, as Jefferson felt with his purchase of the Louisiana Territory.

Opponents of territorial expansion used their interpretations of federal documents and religious beliefs to justify the dooms of territorial expansion. Federalists were extremely strong opponents to expansion. They interpreted the Constitution very closely, for they believed government power very important. Around the time of Jefferson's purchase of the Louisiana Territory and the beginning of the push westward, Federalists took a look at the Constitution through their examination they found that "The Constitution is silent on the subject of the acquisition of territory" (Doc A) therefore the expansion of territory is unconstitutional. They believed that if things are unconstitutional then they shouldn't be done—no expansion.

Another argument used by opponents to expansion was the idea that the city on the hill couldn't be transported elsewhere.
Where we want, the idea of city on the hill is one that has defined US policies. It was created by Puritan John Winthrop during early colonial times. It states that the US is a model, the idea that they are the society/government with mission that has acquired civil liberties and democracy. US leaders have used this idea of their country having the best policies and systems agreed to defend expansion as an attempt to spread this model. Many opponents, however, feel that "the US is anxious to free free government on all, all over the world and continent, but we can't for not all are capable of it." (Doc H) Opponents feel that policies toward expansion need to be constitutional and probable in order for them to work, for at the moment they aren't.

The different ideas from opponents and supporters of territorial expansion in the US in shaping their federal policy derives from their interpretation and beliefs of legislation and personal beliefs. Opponents feel that expansion is unconstitutional and will never occur without continuing US attitude.
of using their system anywhere. Supporters use their ideas of if we have the power then it is just or needs of the people require expansion through forming their ideas. In conclusion the debate over territorial expansion in 1800 - 1855 caused many conflicting ideas to arise before a policy could and would be settled on.
Question 1

Sample: 1A
Score: 9

This excellent essay presents a clear and well-constructed thesis demonstrating a sound understanding of the arguments of supporters and opponents of expansionism and the shaping of federal policy. The essay is extremely effective in the accurate use of all the documents and also provides a substantial array of properly used outside information, including mention of the Treaty of Ghent, War Hawks, the Hartford Convention, the Adams–Onís Treaty, the Compromise of 1820, Worcester v. Georgia, “54°40’ or Fight” and the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. The sophisticated analysis is well represented by the discussion of Calhoun’s transformation from a War Hawk to an opponent of Manifest Destiny and by a proper reference to Turner’s safety valve theory.

Sample: 1B
Score: 5

This essay has a clear thesis noting that factors of politics, economic growth and racism fueled the debate over American expansionism in the first half of the nineteenth century. The essay employs all but one of the documents to support the thesis and demonstrates some degree of analysis in the deployment of the documents. The essay also provides relevant outside information throughout (e.g., Napoleon, James Polk, Toussaint L’Ouverture, James Monroe, Indian Removal) to support its claims regarding the debates over expansion. While the essay’s thesis, levels of documentation, organization and writing pushed it into the 5–7 category, its violation of chronology and its errors (misuse of Documents B and C and references to Metacomet, the organization of Kansas, Seward and Alaskan statehood) prevented it from earning a score higher than 5.

Sample: 1C
Score: 2

This essay has a weak, simplistic thesis that mentions the debate on territorial expansion with no follow-up evaluation of the influence of supporters and opponents of expansion. Five documents (G, I, D, A, H) are mentioned but are poorly used. Document I is misquoted. Document H is not discussed in the sense of Calhoun’s concern over how much Mexican territory the United States should seek to acquire. With very little relevant outside information, the essay is a mish-mash of poorly organized generalizations.