ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND COMPOSITION

SECTION II
Total time—2 hours

Question 1

(Suggested time—40 minutes. This question counts for one-third of the total essay section score.)

The need to memorialize events or people is complex; in some cases, monuments honor moments of great achievement, while in other cases, monuments pay homage to deep sacrifice. A monument’s size, location, and materials are all considerations in planning and creating a memorial to the past.

Read the following seven sources carefully, including the introductory information for each source. Then, in a well-organized essay that synthesizes at least three of the sources for support, examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument.

Make sure your argument is central; use the sources to illustrate and support your reasoning. Avoid merely summarizing the sources. Indicate clearly which sources you are drawing from, whether through direct quotation, paraphrase, or summary. You may cite the sources as Source A, Source B, etc., or by using the descriptions in parentheses.

Source A (Savage)
Source B (photo)
Source C (Downes)
Source D (Kosareff)
Source E (Musser)
Source F (Roadside America)
Source G (Lin)
The following is excerpted from a book on monuments in Washington, D.C.

There is no doubt that the modern state has been built on the mass circulation of the written word. Public monuments, by contrast, offer an anachronistic experience: a face-to-face encounter in a specially valued place set aside for collective gathering. . . . [T]he public monument speaks to a deep need for attachment that can be met only in a real place, where the imagined community actually materializes and the existence of the nation is confirmed in a simple but powerful way. The experience is not exactly in the realm of imagination or reason, but grounded in the felt connection of individual to collective body.

In this way the monumental core in Washington functions somewhat like a pilgrimage site, where communities of believers actually come together in the act of occupying a holy site, seeing a relic, reenacting a sacred event. The rhetoric of civil religion—pilgrimage, holy ground, sacred space—is often used to describe monumental Washington because it does seem to ring true. But we must not forget that in the disenchanted world of the modern secular nation, the monument is not, properly speaking, a sacred site. Typically it holds no relic or spiritual trace of a past presence. The site of the Lincoln Memorial, for instance, did not even exist in Lincoln’s lifetime; it sits quite literally on mud dredged from the Potomac River bottom in the late nineteenth century by the Army Corps of Engineers. The memorial itself contains no actual relic of Lincoln. It is pure representation—a colossal marble statue and the text of two speeches carved on enormous panels, all housed in a neoclassical temple . . . . One of those speeches, the Gettysburg Address, had already been reproduced ad infinitum in newspapers and readers and textbooks long before the monument was built. The major Union veterans’ organization had even sponsored a drive to put a bronze plaque carrying the full speech in schools and public places throughout the nation.

Why make a pilgrimage to a site with no historical significance to read a text that was already everywhere? The answer is simple: the monument manufactures its own aura. In the context of the Lincoln Memorial, the Gettysburg Address ceases to be a mere “mechanical reproduction” and becomes a treasure-piece by virtue of its hand carving in stone, at large scale, in a sequestered space, distinguished by lavish materials and aesthetic refinement. And the monument creates an actual, if temporary, community of readers, who must obey a particular decorum: they must stand at a certain distance to see the text panels in their entirety, which is not the way we ordinarily read—as photographers and filmmakers have observed to great effect . . . . Everything about the experience marks it as extraordinary and authoritative.
Source B

*The Christopher Columbus Monument in Riverside Park.*


The following is a photo of a monument of Christopher Columbus in Riverside Park, Easton, Pennsylvania.

![Photo of the Christopher Columbus Monument](Express-Times/Landov)
The following is excerpted from an online opinion article published in a major newspaper.

The carving of this South Dakota peak into a mounted likeness of Crazy Horse, the great Sioux leader, has been going on since 1948. It’s a slow job. After all this time, only his face is complete. The rest—his broad chest and flowing hair, his outstretched arm, his horse—is still encased in stone. Someday, long after you are dead, it may finally emerge.

The memorial, outside Rapid City, is only a few miles from Mount Rushmore. Both are tributes to greatness. One is a federal monument and national icon, the other a solitary dream. A sculptor, Korczak Ziolkowski, worked at it alone for more than 30 years, roughing out the shape while acquiring a mighty beard and a large family. He died in 1982 and is buried in front of the mountain. His widow, Ruth, lives at the site and continues the mission with her many children.

I have to admit: Mount Rushmore bothers me. It was bad enough that white men drove the Sioux from hills they still hold sacred; did they have to carve faces all over them too? It’s easy to feel affection for Mount Rushmore’s strange grandeur, but only if you forget where it is and how it got there. To me, it’s too close to graffiti.

The Crazy Horse Memorial has some of the same problems: it is most definitely an unnatural landmark. Some of the Indians I met in South Dakota voiced their own misgivings, starting with the fact that it presumes to depict a proud man who was never captured in a photograph or drawn from life.

Kelly Looking Horse, a Sioux artist I talked with as he sewed a skin drum at Mount Rushmore, said there were probably better ways to help Indians than a big statue. He also grumbled that many of the crafts for sale at the memorial were made by South Americans and Navajos and sold to people who wouldn’t know the differences among Indian tribes, or care. Leatrice (Chick) Big Crow, who runs a Boys and Girls Club at the Pine Ridge Reservation, said she thought the memorial was one of those things that could go on swallowing money and effort forever.

But two other Sioux artists—Charlie Sitting Bull, a weaver of intricate beadwork, and Del Iron Cloud, a watercolorist—said they were grateful at least that the memorial gave them free space to show and sell their work. As for the loss of the Black Hills, Mr. Iron Cloud told me, without rancor, that there wasn’t much to be done about it now.

Looking up at the mountain in the golden light of late afternoon, it was hard not to be impressed, even moved, by this effort to honor the memory of a people this country once tried mightily to erase. I came away reminded that eternity is not on our side. The nearby South Dakota Badlands, made of soft and crumbling sediment and ash, will be gone in a geological instant.

The day may sooner come when most human works have worn away as well. When all is lost to rust and rot, what remains may be two enormous granite oddities in the Great Plains: Four men’s heads mysteriously huddled cheek to cheek—a forgotten album cover. And, far bigger, a full-formed Indian on a horse, his eyes ablaze, his long arm pointing out over his beloved Black Hills.
ROSEMEAD—Grandma Mary Pallett must be turning in her grave. The bones of Pallet (1796-1889) and thousands of other San Gabriel Valley pioneers buried at Savannah Memorial Park could be moved to make way for a future development.

“Unless something happens and we get the money from somewhere, I don’t know how we’re going to make it,” said Rosie Gutierrez, treasurer for the El Monte Cemetery Association, which owns the 4-acre graveyard at 9263 Valley Blvd.

The association has enough money to keep the place open at least two years, said Bob Bruesch, vice president of the association and a Garvey School District board member.

Developers have an eye for the cemetery site and the community of Asian businesses and residents nearby would like to see it gone because they think it brings bad luck, Bruesch added.

But Savannah is rich in history and should be preserved, Bruesch argues.

“The pioneers from the Santa Fe Trail would bring their dead along with them, preserved somehow, and bury them here,” he said.

More than 3,000 graves fill the cemetery, dated as early as 1847. Bruesch said more graves are scattered under Valley Boulevard and beneath area businesses. The area also was an Indian burial ground before the corpses of settlers filled the place, Bruesch said.

Bruesch said the association would go for historical landmark status with the state, but fears a lack of resources to pull it off. If the cemetery was sold for development, the association or developer would have to move the graves to another location and notify every relative. That task could cost millions of dollars, Bruesch said.

The association has about 200 more plots it could sell for $1,000 apiece, but it would not bring enough cash to keep Savannah running, Gutierrez said.

“I don’t know what the solution is, I really don’t,” Gutierrez said. “It’s going to take a city like Rosemead to take care of it.”

The following is excerpted from an article published on a Web site for freelance writers and journalists.

It had to be done, but is The Mall* in Washington, D.C. the proper place for a museum that is dedicated to victims and survivors of the Holocaust?

It is not surprising that immediate and intense controversy erupted when plans were publicized to build a Holocaust museum on The Mall in Washington, D.C. The controversy grew from Jewish and non-Jewish communities, primarily due to the fact that a museum dedicated to the memory of the Holocaust would be built in the United States, who did little to stop the Holocaust from occurring, or as one protester said, “Imagine a Holocaust museum in the town whose political sages refused to lift a finger to halt the Holocaust or open our shores to the few survivors! How offensive to any informed individual!”

As the controversy grew, the supporters of the museum felt that building a museum on The Mall would enhance The Mall’s already diverse stories. For example, George Will, a political columnist, states, “No other nation has a broader, graver responsibility in the world . . . No other nation more needs citizens trained to look life in the face” . . .

Clean House Museum Design

The design of the building encouraged further controversy. Supporters did not want a duplicate of other buildings on The Mall, nor do they want something that would cause further anti-Semitism or to downplay the atrocities of the Holocaust.

The Commission of Fine Arts refused the first design, stating the design was too “massive”. The members of the commission felt the massive building would overcome The Mall and take away the main purpose of the museum, which was meant to be a place of remembrance and not to overpower The Mall or its visitors.

Albert Abraham was ready to scratch the design until he realized that the design could still work by downsizing it. Still not overly enthused by the design, it was approved by the Commission. Eventually the Commission would decide not to use Abraham’s firm and asked James Ingo Freed to design the museum.

*The National Mall: a park in Washington, D.C., that stretches from the Lincoln Memorial to the United States Capitol. It contains a number of memorials, museums, and governmental buildings.

“Preserving Memory-National Holocaust Memorial Museum Controversy” by Christine Musser, from suite101.com, copyright © 2008 by Christine Musser. Used by permission.
The following is an entry in an online guide to offbeat tourist attractions.

Washington, DC

H. Elroy Johnson made money trapping lobsters and lived in Harpswell, Maine. In 1939 he posed for a sculpture titled “The Maine Lobsterman,” kneeling before his favorite crustacean while pegging its claw. The sculpture was supposed to be cast in bronze and made part of the Maine exhibit at the 1939 New York World’s Fair. But Maine ran out of money, so the artist just slapped a coat of bronze paint over the plaster model and shipped it to New York. After the Fair ended, the fake bronze statue returned to Maine and spent several decades being moved from city hall to museum to museum. No one seemed to want the man and his lobster. The statue was vandalized, repaired, and ended up in a warehouse where it was eaten by rats.

It wasn’t until poor H. Elroy Johnson died that a bronze cast was finally made of the statue, and eight years after that (1981) it was moved to Washington, DC and dedicated in 1983. It was donated by the Camp Fire Girls of Cundys Harbor, Maine, and reportedly cost $30,000.

A close inspection may reveal tooth marks, but we aren’t promising anything.
The following is excerpted from an online article by Maya Lin, designer of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, D.C.

The use of names was a way to bring back everything someone could remember about a person. The strength in a name is something that has always made me wonder at the “abstraction” of the design; the ability of a name to bring back every single memory you have of that person is far more realistic and specific and much more comprehensive than a still photograph, which captures a specific moment in time or a single event or a generalized image that may or may not be moving for all who have connections to that time.

Then someone in the class [an architectural seminar Lin took during her senior year at Yale University] received the design program, which stated the basic philosophy of the memorial’s design and also its requirements: all the names of those missing and killed (57,000) must be a part of the memorial; the design must be apolitical, harmonious with the site, and conciliatory.

These were all the thoughts that were in my mind before I went to see the site.

Without having seen it, I couldn’t design the memorial, so a few of us traveled to Washington, D.C., and it was at the site that the idea for the design took shape. The site was a beautiful park surrounded by trees, with traffic and noise coming from one side—Constitution Avenue.

I had a simple impulse to cut into the earth.

I imagined taking a knife and cutting into the earth, opening it up, an initial violence and pain that in time would heal. The grass would grow back, but the initial cut would remain a pure flat surface in the earth with a polished, mirrored surface, much like the surface on a geode when you cut it and polish the edge. The need for the names to be on the memorial would become the memorial; there was no need to embellish the design further. The people and their names would allow everyone to respond and remember.

It would be an interface, between our world and the quieter, darker, more peaceful world beyond. I chose black granite in order to make the surface reflective and peaceful. I never looked at the memorial as a wall, an object, but as an edge to the earth, an opened side. The mirrored effect would double the size of the park, creating two worlds, one we are a part of and one we cannot enter. The two walls were positioned so that one pointed to the Lincoln Memorial and the other pointed to the Washington Monument. By linking these two strong symbols for the country, I wanted to create a unity between the nation’s past and present.

The idea of destroying the park to create something that by its very nature should commemorate life seemed hypocritical, nor was it in my nature. I wanted my design to work with the land, to make something with the site, not to fight it or dominate it. I see my works and their relationship to the landscape as being an additive rather than a combative process.

Reprinted with the permission of Simon & Schuster, Inc., from BOUNDARIES by Maya Lin. Copyright © 2000 by Maya Lin Studio Inc. All rights reserved.© 2013 The College Board. Visit the College Board on the Web: www.collegeboard.org.
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Question 1

General Directions: This scoring guide will be useful for most of the essays you read. If it seems inappropriate for a specific paper, ask your Table Leader for assistance. Always show your Table Leader books that seem to have no response or that contain responses that seem unrelated to the question. Do not assign a score of 0 or — without this consultation.

Your score should reflect your judgment of the paper’s quality as a whole. Remember that students had only 15 minutes to read the sources and 40 minutes to write; the paper, therefore, is not a finished product and should not be judged by standards appropriate for an out-of-class assignment. Evaluate the paper as a draft, making certain to reward students for what they do well.

All essays, even those scored 8 or 9, may contain occasional lapses in analysis, prose style, or mechanics. Such features should enter into your holistic evaluation of a paper’s overall quality. In no case should you score a paper with many distracting errors in grammar and mechanics higher than a 2.

9 Essays earning a score of 9 meet the criteria for the score of 8 and, in addition, are especially sophisticated in their argument, thorough in development, or impressive in their control of language.

8 Effective

Essays earning a score of 8 effectively examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. They develop their argument by effectively synthesizing at least three of the sources. The evidence and explanations used are appropriate and convincing. Their prose demonstrates a consistent ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing but is not necessarily flawless.

7 Essays earning a score of 7 meet the criteria for the score of 6 but provide more complete explanation, more thorough development, or a more mature prose style.

6 Adequate

Essays earning a score of 6 adequately examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. They develop their argument by adequately synthesizing at least three of the sources. The evidence and explanations used are appropriate and sufficient. The language may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but generally the prose is clear.

5 Essays earning a score of 5 examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. They develop their argument by synthesizing at least three sources, but how they use and explain sources is somewhat uneven, inconsistent, or limited. The writer’s argument is generally clear, and the sources generally develop the writer’s position, but the links between the sources and the argument may be strained. The writing may contain lapses in diction or syntax, but it usually conveys the writer’s ideas.

4 Inadequate

Essays earning a score of 4 inadequately examine the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. They develop their argument by synthesizing at least two sources, but the evidence or explanations used may be inappropriate, insufficient, or unconvincing. The sources may dominate the student’s attempts at development, the link between the argument and the sources may be weak, or the student may misunderstand, misrepresent, or oversimplify the sources. The prose generally conveys the writer’s ideas but may be inconsistent in controlling the elements of effective writing.

3 Essays earning a score of 3 meet the criteria for the score of 4 but demonstrate less success in examining the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. They are less perceptive in their understanding of the sources, or their explanation or examples may be particularly limited or simplistic. The essays may show less maturity in control of writing.

2 Little Success

Essays earning a score of 2 demonstrate little success in examining the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. They may merely allude to knowledge gained from reading the sources rather than citing the sources themselves. These essays may misread the sources, fail to develop a position, substitute a simpler task by merely summarizing or categorizing the sources or by merely responding to the prompt tangentially with unrelated, inaccurate, or inappropriate explanation. The prose of 2 essays often demonstrates consistent weaknesses in writing, such as grammatical problems, a lack of development or organization, or a lack of control.

1 Essays earning a score of 1 meet the criteria for the score of 2 but are undeveloped, especially simplistic in their explanation, weak in their control of writing, or do not allude to or cite even one source.

0 Indicates an off-topic response, one that merely repeats the prompt, an entirely crossed-out response, a drawing, or a response in a language other than English.

— Indicates an entirely blank response.

* For the purposes of scoring, synthesis means using sources to develop a position and citing them accurately.
In the process of designing and building a monument, the actual image of the monument itself is the least important item on the list. A design team, group, or agency must ponder its mental effect to those who visit and those that the monument will eventually represent. Though there are multiple ways to approach this, three aspects rise above the rest. A monument or historical site must have a sense of preservation, a powerful and extraordinary effect on those who view it, and finally an inherent respect towards those who it represents. Preservation is extremely crucial in this process because a monument will last for the rest of time, if executed properly. In Source C, Lawrence Donahue believes "the day may sooner come when most human works have worn away... what remains may be two enormous granite oddities in the Great Plains." (Source C). Donahue effectively argues that these two monuments, Mt. Rushmore and the still-in-construction Crazy Horse, will long outlive the humans who contributed or saw these great works, leaving a
certain representation for years to come. A team must ensure their planned monument will be protected and preserved, much unlike the “San Gabriel Valley pioneers that we buried at Savannah Memorial Park” (Source D), who are in danger of relocation due to a prospective housing economic development. This cemetery represents much more than some buried people; it sheds light on the history of the Santa Fe Trail pioneers and allows the present to understand the roots of a nation and ancestors. Another example of a lack of preservation is the Lobsterdon Monument, cited in Source F. This statue, proposed in honor of the Fisherman H. Elroy Johnson, was intended to represent and reflect gratitude towards the economy brought by Maine Fishermen. The statue had big plans, including a cast bronze cost and an exhibit at the 1939 World Fair. However, the money ran out and so did support. This statue, intended to represent the hard and dangerous work of Maine Fisherman, was instead “vanized, repaired, and ended up in a warehouse where it was eaten by rats.”
(Source 5). These two examples of neglect and poor planning provide a guide of what not to do when building a work that will be important to many people in the present day and for years to come. If a group cannot effectively design and have plans to protect a monument, it would be much more respectful for its building to be postponed or even cancelled.

After its preservation is accounted for, a monument must inspire a certain effect upon its one's arrival to it. In Source A, Kirk Savage argues the Lincoln Memorial "contains no actual relic of Lincoln. It is pure representation - a colossal marble statue." (Source A) that intends to mean much more than a tribute to the 16th President. A visit to the memorial is the only true way to experience the true power of the experience, like it unites everyone there into a community, as argued by Savage. The Lincoln Memorial is an example of the success in creating the necessary effect, as Savage again writes that "the monument manufactures its own aura." (Source A) that essentially needs us
Further explanation. The photograph by Jim Deegan in Source B creates a similar effect. In the otherwise bleak and dreary looking picture, Christopher Columbus stands there, powerful and solemn. Mentioned in the previous body, Mt. Rushmore and the Crazy Horse monuments hold an awesome effect that will remain long after humanity and the nearby South Dakota Black Hills erode away, leaving only the representation and history these two granite structures bring without fading a single word. Maya Lin, the designer of the Vietnam Memorial, aimed to establish a "mirrored effect [that would] double the size of the park, creating two worlds, one we are a part of and one we cannot enter" (Source 6). Her goal from the very start was to form a sense of awe for those who see the memorial. She wrote in "Making the Memorial" that "by linking these two strong symbols for the country, I wanted to create a unity between the nation's past and present" (Source 6), that allows future students and curious persons to learn about both the U.S. and the world's
Like the Vietnam Memorial, the Columbus Statue, and the Lincoln Memorial, or to natural depictions of the past, seen from Mt. Rushmore and the Crazy Horse Statue, each of these sites provide a specific insight and sense of awe to those who see them. This effect is what makes a memorial a memorial, and if not, these sites contain little historical value.

After a design team creates this presentation and effect, they must ensure the site respects adequately those who it represents or connects to.
Everything is history. As time passes and events occur, memories are made. These memories, however, fade unless they are recorded, and the impulse to remember provokes the creation of monuments. Monuments are important; they should not be created haphazardly because they can easily be minimized if they are not well produced. Before constructing a monument, it is essential to consider the actual value of its subject, as well as potential durability of structure and effect. A monument should be designed to provoke reflection.

A monument remembers, but an essential question deals with what deserves to be remembered. Everything is history. Since that is so, the creation of a monument cannot be justified solely by the previous existence of a person or event. Just because something happened, it is not necessarily worthy of respect or preservation. Additionally, history is many-sided, and the hero of one conquest may be the tragedy of another. This is exemplified by the Black Hills of South Dakota, where two memorials
The first is Mount Rushmore, a monument to American history showcasing the busts of four American presidents. The second is a partially carved statue of Crazy Horse, a Sioux leader (Source C). These two monuments seem to conflict, each other, since the second memorializes a struggle with the government honored in the first, which drove the Sioux from their sacred land and then proceeded to majestically splash their mark across the very mountains. This seems disrespectful; one defining characteristic of a well-done monument is appropriateness.

While great battles may deserve memorialization, does everything? Monuments are, in some ways, art, and artists frequently choose to depict what falls into the category of “everyday life.” An example is a sculpture called “The Maine Lobsterman,” which depicts Elroy Johnson (Source F). The piece is, very simply, meant to show a lobster trapper doing his job. While charming, this was obviously poorly planned, since the original worked was eaten by rats in
an overlooked warehouse. Nobody wanted it; it was not worthy of remembrance, an essentially quality in a monument's subject matter.

Once a monument is made, it demands respect by its existence. When this respect is cheapened, value is lost. Loss of respect can come from disuse or age, which can cause less famous relics to fall into obscurity. The Savannah Memorial Park (Source 7) is in danger of being removed, even though it holds historical remains. "Savannah is rich in history and should be preserved." This may not be possible; monuments cannot be maintained forever. As time passes, some will be erased. Because of this, only truly memorable events should be memorialized.

If an event or a person is really worthy of memorialization, this is well and good—let there be a monument. It should provoke reflection, since this is the true value of memory. By analyzing the past, humans learn and prepare for the future; therefore, a good monument
13. Effective powerful. Power comes with aesthetic design, symbolism, and memory. Maya Lin, the designer of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, suggest that names are effective in personalizing a monument (Source 6). This is positive. A monument should be a memory preserved in a powerful way. Once an event is recorded by any means, it is glorified in human existence. Because of this, actual worth should be considered before construction.
without a doubt, tragedies will occur in life. There will be joyous moments and times of celebration. It is only human to feel the need to memorialize a lost person, an event, or a hero. Monument building is to cope with a loss or to rejoice a success. To create a monument is to never forget. In paying tribute to a person or event through memorializing and constructing monuments, it is crucial to consider the effects of such a project on the community and the environment.

In times of sorrow, entire communities are often affected. The story of events causes a change of attitude and mindset to the future. The pain of tragedy can be through expression of feelings on a community level. For example, the Vietnam War Vietnam monument proudly displays the names of every soldier who died for his country. This use of names makes the war a reality, rather than an abstract idea. The tribute to the veterans, who were wounded during their service, gives them the respect they deserve. Not only does the site brings together families and friends of those who gave their lives. It serves as an outlet to heal and a place to mourn those lost as well as to celebrate their wonderful contributions to this world.
American. The community must be considered when creating a monument, because they are the individuals who are seeking solace and seeking to commemorate.

When planning a commemoration, it is important to consider that the monument will bring people together. In this past week, a boy at my school committed suicide. We are struggling with the reality of the hole we left and the magnitude of the sorrow we feel. He will no longer walk the halls or play the quarterback at our football games. The night after his death, students gathered to pay tribute to him by creating a wooden sign saying "Always remember" with his name on it. Similarly, to how it took the entire city of Kobe to care for the graveyard, it will take our entire community to overcome this tragedy and to remember our beloved. His death brings us together in a way to help his mother and father, sister, friends, teachers, and acquaintances who hurt. The sign helps us remember and the memorial gives us relief. Without an outlet to express our grief, the community and school would have trouble moving on with our lives.

However, monuments may not always appeal to everyone; an important factor in the decision...
to create a monument is whether or not the environment and how it will affect the community will appreciate it, as with Mount Rushmore and we clay indians, some memorials still out as unwantable and undesirable (c) rather than apologizing for destroying the Indians' homes and in the Black Hills, the federal government constructed Mount Rushmore, a statue of four presidents carved into the side of a hill. Although many people acknowledge Mount Rushmore as a celebration of our incredible presidents, the Indians feel that the carvings are undesirable and intriguing. Additionally, the landmarks of Mount Rushmore and even the Crazy Horse Memorial can come across as "unnatural" and resembling graffiti (c). Why destroy the environment when you could preserve it and commemorate the people and notable presidents in other ways? Why deface a mountain? These are the questions the Sioux wonder every day. When the community and environment are so entangled with each other, groups and agencies planning memorials must be conciliatory of both factors and the surroundings. Ultimately, the decision is not whether to build the memorial, but how to build it in a way that is considerate to the community as well as to the environment.
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.

Those who forget history are doomed to repeat it. I had never truly understood these words till I stood face to face with President Lincoln himself, or rather his monument. Until that moment I had only ever read about Lincoln in books and only ever saw his face in two-dimensional, lifeless paintings. It was surreal to stand before the man that revolutionized America, by writing. Although the statue loomed above me, I could feel his unshakeable presence. History had come alive that day.

When memorializing a person or event, it is vital to assess their impact on their nation above all else. A monument symbolizes the nation's dedication to honoring an individual while preserving their ideals. It becomes a strong symbol for the country as it creates a unity between the nation's past and present. Instantly the figure becomes a role model, a lesson for how the nation should act or a mistake that should never be made again.

In our modern society, we are too easily distracted by video games or Facebook to realize the magnitude of the importance of
our history. Sometimes we forget the sacrifices and adversity others experienced. We have shaped our life today, and in those moments is when we need to look around us for a reminder from the past.

In an ideal world we would have a moment for everyone whose ever influenced the world, but realistically this is impossible. Money rules the world and not everyone is willing to spend their tax paying dollars to erect a monument for someone who died long before they were born. When considering finances, the size of the monument must be assessed. It required a great deal of time to create "Mount Rushmore's strange grandeur" (Source C), and even more to keep it maintain it. Despite what we do to preserve it, it will be gone in a geological instant" (Source C). That being said, one cannot overlook the importance of the size and cost of money a monument.

Monuments hold significant meaning to each person who sees it. Whether it be admiration or remembrance. As a result, an important question is raised: Who gets to claim it? This controversial issue is the deciding factor when deciding to build a monument. Although the Holocaust effects of the war were felt all over the world, none was
greater than its impact on Europe. As a
result, debate has ensued over the rightful
location of such an "iconic museum." However, as
each person or group stakes its claim on the
testament, it becomes increasingly
difficult to not offend a group.
The opponents of the Holocaust Museum,
angrily refuted its presence in the U.S., a
country which "refused to lift a finger to halt
the Holocaust." (Source E). Soon the beauty of
creating a monument is overshadowed by the controversy
from each side.

Monuments are meant to stand the test of
time, to make people reflect
about their history. But before this can happen
we must first consider the importance of the
recent person and whether or not we are
willing to immortalize them.
What makes a memorial so special and why are they made? Why do we need them and why are they placed where they are? Memorizing an event or person is a great way to preserve history because everyone agrees that a massive expensive statue is much more entertaining than a boring, dusty, cumbersome textbook. Why not memorialize events or people, well that is what needs to be discussed and planned because society can't memorialize every event or person in history. There just isn't enough time and space. That is why these three factors, location, effect and reason should be considered before memorializing and creating a monument of an important person and event.

The location of a monument is one of the important steps in creating a monument. For example, why would someone build a monument in the middle of the Sahara desert? If no one is going to see a monument then there is no need to construct one but it is also important to not build a monument in a heavily populated, dense area because it could cause conflicts. Albert Abraham created a design for a Holocaust museum on The Mall (The National Mall) in Washington D.C. His plan caused a lot of conflict which led to the denial of his first plan because it was too large. He did not take location into account properly because if he did he would
of made his plan with a smaller design which he later does and a smaller Holocaust museum is built. This is why location should be considered before memorializing an event or person.

The effect of a memorial monument can be positive and negative. The memorial monument at Mount Rushmore has both positive and negative effects. For example to build this monument "white men drove the Sioux from hills they still hold secret" (Source C), which is a negative effect because they have partially destroyed and stole the Sioux's land. There is a lot tension and anger that has been created from creating the monument there.

There should be a beneficial reason behind every monument created. For example the Lincoln Memorial was created to recognize Lincoln's achievements and the country's achievements in order with Lincoln being our president. The Lincoln monument is a good reason to have monument created but the monument of Elroy Johnson, "The Maine Lobsterman" (Source F) was not. For example a monument was planned to be made of him but they cut corners and created a terrible sculpture. The sculpture "was vandalsized, repainted, and ended up in a warehouse where it was eaten by rats" (Source F). That is why the reason behind the monument should be a factor in considering memorializing.
There are copious amounts of sculptures, memorials and monuments in today’s society but not all of them were necessary. That is why these three factors, location, effect, and reason should be considered by a group or committee before being created memorializing an event or person.
Creating memorials and monuments is a large job and incredibly complicated. Agencies who create them have a large responsibility on their shoulders. Monuments and memorials are expected to last forever—and so should their sites. When constructing memorials and monuments the biggest and most important concern should be time, size, and location.

When designing a monument, an important aspect is size. People can assume that the larger the monument, the more importance it has. Source B includes a large photo of a large statue of Christopher Columbus. The statue stands tall and proud. People who see his Christopher Columbus monument will be able to infer the importance of his life by the size and expensive materials used to construct the statue. Source F shares the story of H. Elroy Johnson, a man who made his living by trapping lobsters. The man posed for a sculpture and after 50 years, it was turned into a monument because of its
A2

The story and its purpose was to attract tourists. The materials used to sculpt this monument—and the fact that it was coated in bronze—infused the cost and attraction to this monument. Without its bronze and estimated cost of $30,000, it wouldn't be an attraction to the tourists of Maine. Another important component of monuments is time and patience. Lots of it is needed to complete each monument. In Source F, it took 40 years to make the simple statue a monument. In Source C, after 100 years of constructing the monument Crazy Horse, it is still not completed. Mt. Rushmore palindrome (Source C) took more than 30 years to complete. Successful monuments require a vast amount of time, money, and materials. Tourists are attracted to the monument with the most interesting story.

Location is a large concern when constructing monuments. There is no perfect place for one. A location could seem ideal one day, then years later strike up a controversy. In Source D, the Savannah
Memorial Park is at risk of losing its land. The cemetery site does not bring in profit and residents of who live near by want to get rid of it. The memorial park is barely staying open, the people in that area have no interest for it. Money is a large part of running a memorial site and without it, its impossible. In Source E, there is a controversy whether or not the Mall in Washington, D.C. is the proper place for a Holocaust Memorial Museum. Protestors say that "there should worst America is not the place for the museum because during the Holocaust America refused to "lift a finger" when building a memorial. Location is important to consider because if the builders want it to be supported by the people, they have to build it where its wanted. If a memorial ends up in a place where people won't want it, it will lose funds.

Memorials and monuments are difficult things to build. Time, money, materials, and location are some of the most important factors. Memorials and monuments are important parts of American culture.
Throughout history monuments were designed to remember someone or an event that is important or significant, but is it appropriate to create such a reminder? Monuments may be brilliant and extraordinary, but at what price? They cost millions of dollars, can cause controversial arguments and potentially destroy a naturally beautiful site. Artists cut into the earth and build a reminder of something people just want to forget.

"White men drive the Sioux from hills they still hold sacred, did they have to carve faces all over them too?" (Doc C)

Mount Rushmore contains presidents’ faces that influenced American United States history. But the fact that they pushed a native population out of their home and then have the nerve to imprint faces of men who did it, not appropriate. The Sioux people are upset and hurt by the "unnatural landmark." Now that there is a Crazy Horse Memorial, does that make it okay, even? No. This would be wrong because the native tribe respected land and the curb it had. Downes is "bothered" by the way people adore the monument and forget that there is not a nice story behind it. Thus, a monument can create anger or negative emotions because of the area that they are put.

Monuments are financially expensive and sometimes it costs too much to even finish. The Savannah Memorial Park has several thousands of graves and
the problem with the lack of funds make the process practically impossible. "That task could cost millions of dollars."
The monuments created do not only have to be designed but kept up and added to. The problem is that once you have a monument then how can you move it or pay for it? The memorial park is large, 4 acres, and once they started it, the money quickly disappeared. "Lack of resources" and uncertainty causes problems. Thus, memorials once created are often unable to be continued.

Lastly, similar to the way Mr. Daines felt towards the Crazy Horse Memorial, the Jewish people felt towards the Holocaust museum. "How offensive to any informed individual!" Protester to the museum felt that the monument was contradicting the U.S. involvement. The U.S. didn't stop nor did it help welcome survivors. Memorials are controversial for specifically that reason. What did we do to try to prevent it? The Vietnam memorial, the Korean memorial. All of these were justifiable. They were wars that killed people and we honor those who died. The people didn't have to die. Thus, monuments are controversial.

Overall, people are often offended by buildings, monuments and memorials set up to "honor" those who have fallen. Plaques about a fallen police officer or firefighter are two-sided cause that person could've been a bad husband or wife but good at his/her job. The costs are extremely high to alter, maintain or take down monuments. Thus, these documents are all connected in that they understand the difficulties and wrongness of a monument.
Monuments are not as necessary because they are not as necessary as maybe a picture or a little or a lot still affects people's views and cultural ideas. The authors of these three documents understand the tells a memorial has on its surroundings. An example of another controversial memorial is the 9/11 memorial. It was a tragic event and certain people choose to honor their lost loved ones more privately. Overall, the monument's design, place, and cost could almost outweigh the advantages of creating one.
To have a memorial made in honor of someone is an achievement that many are worthy of, but some people don't. To memorialize an event or a person takes time and it takes money. For example, the Abraham Lincoln Memorial was not even made in his lifetime. (Source A). What needs to be discussed when building a memorial is whether or not it is worth the time and money, and the location.

According to Source D, the thousands of San Gabriel Valley pioneers buried at Savannah Memorial Park could be moved for a future development. The issue with this is that while nearby residents would like the cemetery to be moved, Savannah's history is very strong and should not be tampered with.

Another issue regarding memorial location is evident in Source E. Much controversy has come about regarding the location of the Holocaust Museum. Many Jewish communities, and even some non-Jewish communities disagree with the museum being built in the United States. While the Holocaust was happening, the United States did very little to stop it. However, counter arguments say that the Holocaust Memorial brings diversity to The Mall.

Other problems when making memorials regard money. According to Source F, H. Eliot Johnson, who made money trapping lobsters, was supposed to have a sculpture of him posing with a lobster in the 1939 New
New York World's Fair. However, there was no money to finance the building of the statue. Instead of a sculpture, the plaster model, coated in bronze paint, was sent to the fair. The idea of the statue was clever, but it just couldn't be funded.

Not only does it take time to choose a person worthy of a memorial, but it also takes time to build. According to Source C, the carving of Crazy Horse, the great Sioux Leader, has been going on since 1948. It is a lengthy task to make a memorial. There are many things to think of when building a memorial; location, cost, time and effort being put into it and popularity. The ending product will be an historical landmark if all the variables are accounted for.
I believe monuments should only be built if the person, place, or thing is worth remembering. For example in [photo], Christopher Columbus was remembered for discovering the Americas. He made a major impact on world history and geography. Agencies or groups should strongly consider major impacts on creating a monument.

The crazy horse memorial was an unnatural landmark. [Downes]. It was created freely with no physical viewing. It portrayed "a proud man who was never captured in a photograph or drawn from life." There is no significance of this man in history, in which I believe this landmark is not worth being remembered. Memorials should only be built on extreme history. They require a plethora of time and money. If a monument is being created it should have 75% significance to the human race. I believe that if most people don't know who or what it is, it should not be created. Mount Rushmore depicts our presidents. In my opinion I believe each president carved on to that stone did something remarkable for our nation and they deserve to be recognized in our
Question 1

Landmarks. In Source C, I disagree with the author about Mount Rushmore about it being a "bother." In Source D, I believe the cemetery should be converted into historical landmark status. Each person that is buried there died and is remembered by their family. All or those or at least most or those people have families and equally that is a memorial site. I believe it is disrespectful to transport the graves.
Question 1

Sample Identifier: DD
Score: 9

- The student offers a sophisticated argument examining three essential factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument: preservation, lasting effect, and respect for what is being represented.
- The essay opens with an insightful counterargument to those who would claim the "actual image of the monument" is the primary consideration, arguing that a monument’s "mental effect" is a far more important factor.
- The sources selected illustrate a critical understanding of each source’s position, allowing the student to engage the sources in a meaningful dialogue to facilitate the student’s own argument. In particular, the second paragraph contrasts the permanence of Mount Rushmore and the carving of Crazy Horse in the South Dakota Badlands with the neglect of the burial site of San Gabriel Valley pioneers in Savannah Memorial Park, lamenting the loss of history that "allows the present to understand the roots of a nation and ancestors."
- The sources are well cited in a variety of ways, some using the last name of the author of the source, some using the source letter in parentheses, and some using both methods. The student uses apt signal phrases and smoothly integrates the source material into the student’s own prose: e.g., "In Source A, Kirk Savage argues the Lincoln Memorial ‘contains no actual relic of Lincoln. It is pure representation – a colossal marble statue’ (Source A)."
- Within the two major body paragraphs, the student cites numerous sources, and their relation to one another as well as to the argument they serve is always clear. The effective synthesis and organization of at least three sources allows the student’s argument to move forward, unpacking further meaning as each body paragraph develops. When examining the possible relocation of the burial site of the San Gabriel Valley pioneers and the neglected state of the statue of H. Elroy Johnson, the student provides an insightful consideration: "If a group cannot effectively design and have plans to protect a monument, it would be much more respectful for its building to be postponed or even cancelled."
- The essay receives a score of 9 based on the sophistication of its argument, thoroughness of its development, effectiveness in synthesizing sources, and impressiveness of its coherent and mature writing style.

Sample Identifier: HH
Score: 8

- The student develops an effective argument examining two key factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument: value of the subject being memorialized, the "potential durability of structure and effect," and the promotion of reflection.
- In the second paragraph, the student thoughtfully qualifies that since "[e]verything is history," people need to be careful in their selection of "what deserves to be remembered" because "the creation of a monument cannot be justified solely by the previous existence [sic] of a person or event. The student proceeds to clarify this idea by contrasting the Mount Rushmore memorial with the statue of Crazy Horse as effective evidence that "heroic conquests of one side may be the tradgedy [sic] of another" because it is not appropriate to memorialize a person or event that might be "disrespectful" to another person or event.
The student selects four key sources, and while each source is examined in a separate paragraph, the links between the paragraphs and the sources allow the student to effectively synthesize the ideas. The opening of the third paragraph continues the student's argument that careful selection of events is critical in deciding whether a person or event should be memorialized, noting that "monuments are, in some ways, art, and artists frequently choose to depict what falls in the category of 'everyday life.'" However, the student maintains that H. Elroy Johnson and lobster trapping are "not worth of remembrance," as evidenced by neglect. The sources are clearly cited, and the discussion of how each source supports the student's argument is fully developed and convincing.

The essay earns an 8 for its effectiveness in argumentation, synthesis of sources, and consistent ability to control a wide range of the elements of effective writing, particularly evidenced in its coherence and transitions.

Sample Identifier: KK
Score: 7

The student adequately argues that the most crucial factor a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument is "the effect of such a project on the community and the environment." The student's examination of how memorials help people cope with loss and rejoice in success unifies the essay.

In the second paragraph, the student provides a full explanation of how memorials like the Vietnam Veterans Memorial serve as an "outlet to heal and a place to mourn those lost as well as to celebrate," emphasizing the duality of effects that a memorial can have on a community. The student follows this discussion with a personal example that advances the argument.

The student provides a thorough explanation of how the controversy surrounding the Mount Rushmore monument and the statue of Crazy Horse provides a counter example to the positive effects a memorial can have on a community, noting that "although many feel a sense of national pride for Mount Rushmore, a commemoration of our incredible presidents, the Indians feel that the carvings are undesirable [sic] and intruding."

The student adequately synthesizes at least three sources and sufficiently cites each source using parentheses.

The essay rises to a 7 because it uses the community function of monuments as an organizing theme, providing a more complete explanation and thorough development of how the sources serve the writer's central argument.

Sample Identifier: EEE
Score: 6

The student establishes ownership of the argument by opening the essay with a personal reflection of a visit to the Lincoln Memorial, which connects appropriately with the position that the "vital" factor a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument is its "impact on their nation above all else," because "a monument symbolizes the nation's dedication to honoring an individual, while preserving their ideals."

While the student acknowledges in the third paragraph that in an "ideal world we would have a moment [sic] for everyone," the student proceeds to adequately examine how "one cannot overlook the importance of the size and cost of a monument."
In the fourth paragraph, the student is not entirely successful in connecting the controversy over claiming a monument to the essay’s overarching argument; however, the explanation of the debate over the location of the Holocaust Memorial Museum remains sufficient.

Even though each source is examined in a separate paragraph, the links between the paragraphs and the sources allow the student to adequately synthesize the ideas from the sources. The student cites sources appropriately and smoothly integrates a piece of each source into an argument that responds adequately to the prompt.

The essay earns a 6 for its adequate argumentation of the topic, use of sources as support for the argument, and generally clear prose style.

Sample Identifier: UU
Score: 5

- The student opens the argument with some rhetorical questions connected to the topic prior to identifying three key factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument: location, effect, and reason.
- Although essays scoring in the upper range do sometimes use each factor as an organizing element, the links between the factors and paragraphs in this essay are strained, and the formulaic structure keeps the essay from adequately developing the student’s argument.
- The student provides limited explanation for how each factor contributes to decisions about memorializing people or events, using a single source for each factor as support for the explanation. However, the discussion of the “reason behind every monument created” (paragraph 4) provides more sufficient examination of the contrast between the desire “to recognize Lincoln’s achievements and the country’s achievements with Lincoln being our president” and the lack of planning that accompanied an inappropriate reason for constructing the state of H. Elroy Johnson.
- Although the student uses at least three sources and cites those sources appropriately, the relationship between the points discussed from the sources is strained and incompletely developed in some places. In paragraph three, for example, the student attempts to explain that the “effect of a monument can be positive and negative” but only notes the negative effect created by Mount Rushmore because those who built the memorial “destroyed and stole the Sioux’s lands.” In this part of the essay, the student confuses the historical background of the monument with the effects of the monument.
- The essay earns a 5 for its limited and uneven explanation of how the sources contribute to the student’s examination of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument.

Sample Identifier: A
Score: 4

- The student identifies three factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument: time, size, and location.
- In the second paragraph, the student discusses both factors of time and location; however, the three sources selected as support dominate the student’s attempt at development. The student oversimplifies the sources – for instance, by claiming that the statue of Christopher Columbus “stands tall and proud” and the sculpture of H. Elroy Johnson “wouldn’t be an attraction to the tourists of Maine” because of the problems with its construction.
In the third paragraph, the student attempts to discuss the importance of location at the Savannah Memorial Park and the Holocaust Memorial Museum; however, the student inadequately explains the controversy surrounding each of those locations, noting only that “protestors say that America isn’t the place for the museum because during the Holocaust America refused to ‘lift a finger.’”

While the student selects and cites at least three sources for inclusion in the argument, the links between the sources and the student’s position are weak. The student makes repeated use of sentences that begin “In Source D” and “In Source E” without linking the sources to one another in a synthesis.

The essay earns a 4 for its insufficient and unconvincing explanations of how the sources contribute to the student’s examination of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument.

Sample Identifier: III
Score: 3

- The student opens the essay questioning whether it is “appropriate” to create a memorial but does not clearly identify the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument. The final sentence of the essay does vaguely summarize the student’s argument, noting that a monument’s “design, place, and cost could almost outweigh the advantages of creating one.”
- The student selects three sources but struggles to connect any of the sources with the points being made in each paragraph, often dropping in quotations that are not smoothly integrated into the discussion. In discussing the cost factor, the student provides a less perceptive explanation of the problems associated with the Savannah Memorial Park, asking “once you have a monument then how can you move it or pay for it?”
- The student attempts to provide additional sources, but the explanations are weak and simplistic, arguing that “[pl]aques about a fallen police officer or firefighter are two-sided cause [sic] that person could’ve been a bad husband or wife but good at his/her job.”
- The essay earns a 3 instead of a 4 for its less perceptive and particularly limited explanation of the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument, and for its less mature control of elements of writing, particularly diction and syntax.

Sample Identifier: NN
Score: 2

- The student demonstrates little success in developing a position, identifying simply that “[t]o memorialize an event or a person takes time and it takes money.”
- The sources dominate the essay, which does little more than string together fragmented pieces of five sources and provide a summary rather than an argument.
- Although each source is cited appropriately, the student repeats simplistic constructions such as “According to Source F” or “in Source E.”
- The essay earns a 2 for its lack of development and little success in examining the factors to be considered in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument.
Sample Identifier: II
Score: 1

- The student chooses a much simpler task of making personal assertions rather than examining the factors a group or agency should consider in memorializing an event or person and in creating a monument.
- The use of "I believe" statements permeates the essay, ensuring an especially undeveloped argument and distorted use of sources. In addition, the student misreads Downes by noting that since Crazy Horse had never been photographed, there is "no significance of this man in history, in which I believe this landmark is not worth being remembered."
- The student ends the essay by dropping in two sources with some hurried evaluation about the circumstances surrounding Mount Rushmore and the Savannah Memorial Park.
- The essay earns a 1 for its undeveloped approach to the task and for its weak control of writing.