The following question is based on documents (A-D). Some of these documents have been edited for this exercise. This question is designed to test your ability to work with historic documents. As you analyze these documents and answer the questions, take into account the sources of the document and the author’s point of view.

Assignment:
• Analyze documents
• Answer questions for each document
• Outline to organize your essay
• Write a well-organized essay (introduction, supporting paragraphs and a conclusion).
• Use evidence from the documents and your knowledge of American History to answer the essay question with citations
• Answer every part of the essay question

Depression swept through Europe after World War I aiding to the rise of dictatorships seeking world domination such as Hitler, Mussolini, and Japanese Warlords. Many U.S. citizens and congressional members wanted to prevent trade involving arms negotiations that led to the U.S. involvement in World War I. Many Americans struggled with their belief in reaming isolationists or protecting America through defending democracy else where in the world. This struggle increased as Hitler gained control of Europe. Roosevelt convinced Congress to repeal the Arms embargo of 1939 and enacted polices such as Lend Lease Act and Atlantic Charter that ended any impression of American neutrality towards the War. Japanese Aggression in Indo China had peaked leading Roosevelt to freeze all Japanese assets and enact an embargo on all trade with Japan. Both sides refused to compromise on their position leading to the break down of negotiations. Washington’s “the magic” cracked the secret code of the Japanese and learned that the Japanese were about to attack. Messages about the attack were sent to Pacific commanders. The messages did not mention Pearl Harbor but did report large scale ship movements heading towards South East Asia.

Question: Why were America’s defenses surprised and unprepared for the attack on Pearl Harbor? Describe the arguments over why America was left vulnerable.
What broken negotiations do the messages refer to, and what parties are involved?

What do the messages warn Pacific Commanders to prepare for? What evidence do they supply to support their predictions?

Where do the messages suggest the attack(s) will occur? Is there any information that indicates the U.S. Government is warning the Pacific Commanders that the attack will take place at Pearl Harbor?
The so-called "war warning" dispatch of November 27 did not warn the Pacific Fleet of an attack in the Hawaiian area. It did not state expressly or by implication that an attack in the Hawaiian area was imminent or probable. It did not repeal or modify the advice previously given me by the Navy Department that no move against Pearl Harbor was imminent or planned by Japan.

The phrase "war warning" cannot be made a catch-all for all the contingencies hindsight may suggest. It is a characterization of the specific information which the dispatch contained. . . .

In brief, on November 27, the Navy Department suggested that I send from the immediate vicinity of Pearl Harbor the carriers of the fleet, which constituted the fleet's main striking defense against an air attack.*

On November 27, the War and Navy Departments suggested that we send from the island of Oahu [site of Pearl Harbor] 50 percent of the Army's resources in pursuit planes.

These proposals came to us on the very same day of the so-called "war warning."

In these circumstances no reasonable man in my position would consider that the "war warning" was intended to suggest the likelihood of an attack in the Hawaiian area.

From November 27 to the time of the attack, all the information which I had from the Navy Department or from any other source, confirmed, and was consistent with, the Japanese movement in southeast Asia described in the dispatch of November 27. . . .

In short, all indications of the movements of Japanese military and naval forces which came to my attention confirmed the information in the dispatch of 27 November-that the Japanese were on the move against Thailand or the Kra [Malay] Peninsula in southeast Asia.

---

1. What is Admiral Kimmel's complaint about the "war warning"?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

2. According to the Admiral why did they lack equipment, and supplies to fight the attack?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

3. Based on Document B and A is his argument valid? What evidence supports this view?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
Many of the discussions on this subject indicated a failure to grasp the fundamental difference between the duties of an outpost command and those of the commander in chief of an army or nation and his military advisers.

The outpost commander is like a sentinel on duty in the face of the enemy. His fundamental duties are clear and precise. He must assume that the enemy will attack at his particular post; and that the enemy will attack at the time and in the way which it will be most difficult to defeat him. It is not the duty of the outpost commander to speculate or rely on the possibilities of the enemy attacking at some other outpost instead of his own. It is his duty to meet him at his post at any time and to make the best possible fight that can be made against him with the weapon with which he has been supplied.

On the other hand, the Commander in Chief of the Nation (and his advisers) has much more difficult and complex duties to fulfill. Unlike the outpost commander, he must constantly watch, study, and estimate where the principal or most dangerous attack is most likely to come, in order that he may most effectively distribute his insufficient forces and munitions to meet it. He knows that his outposts are no all equally supplied or fortified, and that they are not all equally capable of defense He knows also that from time to time they are of greatly varying importance to the grand strategy of the war.

General Short had been told the two essential facts: (1) A war with Japan is threatening. (2) Hostile action by Japan is possible at any moment. Given those two facts, both of which were stated without equivocation in the message of November 27, the outpost commander should be on the alert to make his fight.

Even without any such message, the outpost commander should have been on the alert. If he did not know that the relations between Japan and the United States were strained and might be broken at any time, he must have been almost the only man in Hawaii who did not know it, for the radio and the newspapers were blazoning out those facts daily, and he had a chief of staff and an intelligence officer to tell him so.

Under these circumstances, which were of general knowledge and which he must have known, to cluster his airplanes in such groups and positions that in an emergency they could not take to the air for several hours, and to keep his anti-aircraft ammunition and immediately available, and to use his best reconnaissance system, the radar, only for a very small fraction of the day and night, in my opinion betrayed a misconception of his real duty which was almost beyond belief.

1. According to Stimson, what is admiral Kimmel’s responsibility as an outpost commander?

2. According to Stimson, why was the information Admiral Kimmel had sufficient to be able to defend Pearl Harbor from Attack?

3. What other criticism does Stimson give about Kimmel's lack of action to respond to the attack? Are they valid and what evidence supports your view?
Commander Schultz and Mr. Richard

Commander Schultz. The President read the papers, which took perhaps ten minutes. Then he handed them to [long-time Roosevelt adviser] Mr. [Harry] Hopkins. . . . Mr. Hopkins then read the papers and handed them back to the President. The President then turned toward Mr. Hopkins and said in substance... "This means war." Mr. Hopkins agreed, and they discussed then, for perhaps five minutes, the situation of the Japanese forces, that is, their deployment and.....

Mr. Richardson [committee counsel] Can you recall what either of them said?

Commander Schultz. In substance I can. . . . Mr. Hopkins. . . expressed a view that since war was undoubtedly going to come at the convenience of the Japanese, it was too bad that we could not strike the first blow and prevent any sort of surprise. The President nodded and then said in effect, "No, we can't do that. We are a democracy and a peaceful people." Then he raised his voice, and this much I remember definitely. He said, "But we have a good record."

The impression that I got was that we would have to stand on that record; we could not make the first overt move. We would have to wait until it came.

During this discussion there was no mention of Pearl Harbor. The only geographic name I recall was Indochina. The time at which war might begin was not discussed, but from the manner of the discussion there was no indication that tomorrow was necessarily the day.

Pearl Harbor Attack, pt X, pp. 46624663.

1. According to Schultz what were the President and Advisory discussing?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

2. What impression did Schultz get from the conversation?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________

3. In your opinion, does the document imply any evidence President Roosevelt contributed to the lack of America's defense at Pearl Harbor?

_____________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________________
Question: Why were America's defenses surprised and unprepared for the attack on Pearl Harbor? Describe the arguments over why America was left vulnerable.

Directions: The following question is based on documents (A-F). Some of these documents have been edited for this exercise. This question is designed to test your ability to work with historic documents. As you analyze these documents and answer the questions; take into account the sources of the document and the author’s point of view.

- Analyze documents
- Answer questions for each document
- Write a well-organized essay (introduction, supporting paragraphs and a Conclusion).
- Use evidence from the documents and your knowledge of American History to answer the essay question
- Answer every part of the essay question

Rubric


B. Well-developed essay which addresses the question. Clear thesis. Analyzes documents and includes considerable outside information. May contain minor errors.

C. Addresses question generally. Limited thesis supported by evidence. More descriptive than analytical, use of some relevant outside information. May contain errors, usually not major documents.

D. Essay is a partial restatement of question. Unsupported thesis. Paraphrases documents with little or no analysis. Little or no outside information. May contain serious errors.

F. Essay is poorly developed, reflects inadequate understanding of the question. May have no thesis. Incomplete listing of documents. Erroneous and/or irrelevant outside information.
# DBQ Essay Rubric Grade Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>AP Essay Raw Score:</strong> (0-9)</th>
<th><strong>AP Grade:</strong> (1-5)</th>
<th><strong>Class Grade:</strong> (% of 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior Essay “5”: AP Score of 8-9</td>
<td>Strong Essay “4”: AP Score of 6-7</td>
<td>Adequate Essay “3”: AP Score of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent use of documents (at least two more than half)</td>
<td>Good use of documents (at least 1 more than half)</td>
<td>Adequate use of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent use of outside information</td>
<td>Good use of outside info. (needs more)</td>
<td>Fairly well-organized essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent analysis of key issues</td>
<td>Good analysis of key issues (needs more)</td>
<td>Addresses all areas of the prompt but essay may lack balance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent use of concrete facts</td>
<td>Well-organized essay</td>
<td>Includes some outside information (but clearly needs more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely well-organized essay</td>
<td>Lacks outside information</td>
<td>Needs more analysis of key issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses all areas of the prompt</td>
<td>Essay does not address one or more aspects of the question:</td>
<td>Contains some evidence; more needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely well-written essay</td>
<td></td>
<td>May contain some historical errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contains facts irrelevant to the time period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**“2” Essay: AP Score of 2-4**
- Undeveloped thesis (simple thesis)
- Thesis does not fully address question
- Poor use of documents
- Documents control the essay
- Weak organization
- Lacks outside information
- Essay does not address one or more aspects of the question:
- Lacks analysis of key issues
- Lacks evidence to support main ideas
- Contains major historical errors
- Much irrelevant information to time period

**“1” Essay: AP Score of 1**
- No documents used
- No thesis
- Facts not specific, accurate & relevant
- Poor or no analysis of key issues

**General Comments:**
- Thesis/intro: complex-split ; complex-simple ; split-simple ; simple ; too much info
- Contains vague statements or generalizations not supported by facts.
- Cite all documents
- Use more documents
- Document quotes are too long
- Document(s) misused: # ___ Laundry list ___ Don’t explain documents
- Strong conclusion ___ Weak conclusion ___ No conclusion
- Strong topic sentences ___ Weak topic sentences ___ Strong linking sentences
- Don’t use “I,” “you,” “our,” “us,” “we” ___ Don’t connect issues to “today” (unless asked)
- Poor spelling and grammar ___ Poor penmanship: essay difficult to read
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