Question 3 — Comparative

BASIC CORE (competence) 0–7 Points

1. Has acceptable thesis. 1 Point
   - The thesis must include both a valid similarity and a valid difference in methods of political control in two of the empires.
   - The thesis must be relevant to the time period, but the dates need not be explicit.
   - The thesis must be explicitly stated in the introduction or the specified conclusion of the essay.
   - The thesis may appear as one sentence or as multiple sentences.
   - A thesis that is split among multiple paragraphs or merely restates the prompt is unacceptable.
   - The thesis CANNOT count for any other point.

2. Addresses all parts of the question, though not necessarily evenly or thoroughly. 2 Points
   For 2 points:
   - Identifies at least one valid similarity and one valid difference in methods of political control.
   - Discusses two empires but not necessarily evenly.
   For 1 point:
   - Identifies at least one valid similarity or at least one valid difference in methods of political control.
   - Discusses two empires but not necessarily evenly.

3. Substantiates thesis with appropriate historical evidence. 2 Points
   For 2 points:
   - Must provide at least five specific pieces of evidence (at least two from each empire).
   - Evidence must be within the designated time periods (e.g., evidence from the Roman Republic or Qin dynasty is not acceptable).
   For 1 point:
   - Must provide at least three specific pieces of evidence (at least one from each empire).
   - Evidence must be within the designated time periods.

4. Makes at least one direct, relevant comparison between/among societies. 1 Point
   (The direct comparison may discuss either similarities or differences.)
   - To earn this point, the comparison must be made somewhere other than in the thesis.

5. Analyzes at least one reason for a similarity or a difference identified in a direct comparison. 1 Point
   - Analysis (reason why) must be related to a similarity or a difference in methods of political control between the two empires.

Subtotal 7 Points
Question 3 — Comparative (continued)

EXPANDED CORE (excellence)  0–2 Points
Expands beyond basic core of 1–7 points. A student must earn 7 points in the basic core area before earning points in the expanded core area.

Examples:

- Has a clear, analytical and comprehensive thesis.
- Addresses all parts of the question thoroughly (as relevant): comparisons, chronology, causation, connections, themes, interactions, content.
- Provides ample historical evidence to substantiate thesis.
- Relates comparisons to larger global context.
- Makes several direct, relevant comparisons between or among societies.
- Consistently analyzes the causes and effects of relevant similarities and differences.
- Applies relevant knowledge of other regions or world historical processes.
- Discusses change over time (e.g., changing methods of political control as the empires began to decline).
- Recognizes nuances within empires.

Subtotal  2 Points

TOTAL  9 Points
Write in the box the number of the question you are answering on this page as it is designated in the exam.

Roman from 708 BCE to 220 CE and imperial Rome from 7 BCE to 476 CE both had an unquite border situation in terms of politics, employing two family unit and the authority of parents. However, Rome and China had two very different political systems, reasons in which they dealt with their leaders, the norms in society as a whole, and religion. However, both empire ultimately fell due to their inability to manage such a large territory and defend such extensive borders.

The political differences can be attributed to differences in society and culture. In China, Confucianism was the ideology that dictated "everything" there as a Confucianism emphasized family, society was viewed as a family unit. This combined with the importance of filial piety created a very centralized, close knit political system. In Rome, the religion and ideology was much less centralized, however, the patrician families did play an important role in society. However, because there was less emphasis on a group in Rome, the political organization was a lot less structured than China's.

In China, the empire was run by an emperor who ruled on a mandate of heaven. The situation was relatively stable and there was less emphasis...
on expansion. Rather, China sought to maintain its borders and occasionally trade for commodities it desired (mostly silk). On the other hand, Rome had a complex, decentralized structure. Consuls were only given a year in service, and as a result they tried to achieve glory in one year, often through drastic means. The emperors on conquest put a huge strain on Rome's resources and manpower, and there was not enough labor to supply the food that the growing empire needed.

Both Roman and Chinese empires had unstable borders and were surrounded by dangerous enemies. However, Han China dealt with the Turan Huns through the tribute systems, thus pacifying them with gifts and avoiding costly and expensive warfare, which Rome preferred when dealing with their enemies. Also, both empires had significant technology, organization, and armies, albeit very different ones. Rome excelled at battle tactics, military organization, and had good generals, armies, and horses. Han China experimented with gunpowder, used the longbow, and obtained horses from their neighbors.

Ultimately, both empires fell, due to the cost of keeping such an extensive empire, as well as the energy they focused on maintaining borders.
The classical empires experienced periods of great power often by great centralization of power, and expansion of empires. This is true of the Maurya/Gupta India and Han China, but their methods of maintaining their political control varied in some ways. Both India and China centralized power through military buildup and national work projects. However, classical India was able to maintain their power through the centralization of one belief system; however, this belief system which created the foundation of their states differed, leading to a different system of establishing the state’s administrative system.

Han and China and Maurya/Gupta both consolidated their power through military buildup. Han’s Wudi established a strong military and strong defense system. He instigated nation civic work projects in order to centralize his power while providing something for his people. For example, he increased the fortification of the Great Wall; he also created irrigation projects which brought the Chinese together under his rule. Similarly, Ashoka Maurya and Ashoka Maurya built up their military power in order to centralize control. They expanded this empire and brought the people under his centralized power. In addition, the Han and
The Gupta dynasties centralized one belief system within their empires, that brought the people together under his power. However, this is where they diverge.

India and China both imposed one belief system that was agreeable with the people of their respective empires. India was largely Hindu, with a Buddhist minority, but under Ashoka Maurya, the empire was tolerant. China was Confucian during the Han Dynasty. These differences in belief systems created different social orders.

India, under the Hindu belief system, imposed a strict social class system, known as the caste system. During one's lifetime, there was no room for social mobility. A Hindu could only prove himself in this life in order to move up in the next life. This created a social order where the people were able to better themselves and were willing to contribute to their empire. Their highest class were valued as priests. That was their ultimate goal. Under Ashoka's rule, Buddhism also flourished briefly due to the ruler's religious toleration, but the Gupta dynasty was shortly Hindu. However, they still were largely at peace and experienced a
Golden Age of the florebing and patronizing of the arts. Similarly in China, Han rulers followed a belief system, but this was Confucian philosophy which emphasized different values. Confucian philosophy promoted a civil examination service, which provided for social mobility. They emphasized a person's relationship to one another and with the state. As opposed to priests, China valued bureaucrats in their administrative system. Due to their lack of a devout religion, China was able to assimilate the Huns when they began to invade China. They accepted them if they were of value to the state.

Both Han China and Maurya/Gupta India consolidated their power on the same foundations of an empire; however, they built up a military and imposed one belief system, but this differing belief system led to differing ways in which their administration was run and differing social orders.
Empire Rome evolved through a political process of a Kingdom to a Republic to an empire. Han China on the other hand was only an empire and did not go through the same evolutionary process that Imperial Rome went through. However, both the Han China and Imperial Rome lost political control of their empire leading to its decline.

When Imperial Rome started as a Kingdom, the Etruscan Kingdom did not last long however and it was taken over by conquered and made a Republican. The Republic comprises of a Senate which was made up of the senators and Plebeians. The Plebeians and senators hardly ever agree on anything as the senators were aristocrats and the plebeians commoners.

However, the rise of a single senator, Julius Caesar, saw Rome's transformation from a Republic to an empire. Julius Caesar was a charismatic man and after escaping the civil war he declared himself a dictator. However, he was killed in a near future. His nephew and protege Augustus expanded the empire. He defeated Cleopatra and Mark Anthony making sure that Rome is politically secured. After, however, after the death of Augustus, the later emperor were unable to politically control Rome as former leader were able to eventually leading to its division and ultimate decline.
Han China succeeded the Qin dynasty after it declined. The Han dynasty tried to centralized China. The first emperor was very strict and with the help of the ideologies of Legalism he was able to rule a nation that had just had it en a dynasty crumble (qin). To better administer his regime, he sought his noble relatives and gave them land in exchange for their support but they proved useless as at a time they were highly needed. However, The emperor used a regional leader so as to help him better control the empire. After the death of the first Han emperor, however, the empire was in chaos.

The size of both empires was an issue that led to leaders ultimately losing control. Political control of both empires Han for example was way too big and expensive to maintain as was Rome, what made the situation worse was that the latter leader were unable to control the people, especially the peasants which led to protest and rebellion like the Yellow Turban rebellion in Han. The vastness of both empires and few resources to control the empire too made it very vulnerable to attack as both empires were invaded by foreigners which led to their division and decline.

The political control of both imperial Rome and Han China was very centralized. The leaders were able to set laws
and reformed that changed the empire for good. Both empires also expanded and because of such expansion led to them being unable to control the empires politically control the empire.
Overview

The intent of the question was for students to pick two of the stipulated empires — Han China (206 B.C.E. to 220 C.E.), Mauryan/Gupta India (320 B.C.E. to 550 C.E.), Imperial Rome (31 B.C.E. to 476 C.E.) — and compare the ways those empires exerted political control over their populaces. Students were explicitly told to discuss both similarities and differences in methods of political control.

Sample: 3A
Score: 8

The essay contains a valid thesis in the second and third sentences of the first paragraph (1 point). In the fourth paragraph, the essay addresses a similarity (“Both empires had unstable borders”) and several differences, including “However, Han China dealt with the Turkic Huns through the tribute systems, thus placating them with gifts and avoiding costly & expensive warfare, which Rome preferred when dealing with their enemies” (2 points). Although there is ample evidence for the Han, Roman evidence is limited by discussion of the Republic, which could not be counted. There is, however, enough evidence for 2 evidence points. In addition to the direct comparison listed above, there is another difference at the bottom of the second paragraph — “However, because there was less emphasis as a collective group in Rome, the political organization was a lot less structured than China’s” — which earned 1 point for the comparison and 1 point because the statement also involves an analysis. This essay contained a complex thesis, sufficient depth of comparison, and supporting evidence to earn 1 Expanded Core point.

Sample: 3B
Score: 6

This essay contains a valid thesis in the first paragraph (1 point) and addresses both similarities and differences (2 points). There is sufficient evidence for both the Mauryan/Gupta and the Han empires (2 points). The direct comparison is found in the second paragraph: “Han China and Maurya Gupta [sic] both consolidated their power through military buildup” (1 point). The essay attempts analysis in the next to the last paragraph but only analyzes the Han: “Due to their lack of a devout religion, China was able to assimilate the Huns when they began to invade China.” There is no analysis of a comparison of Han and Mauryan/Gupta methods of political control.

Sample: 3C
Score: 3

There is no valid thesis because the essay attempts to show a difference between Han and Rome in terms of the Roman Republic, which is outside the time period. The essay only addresses similarities, not valid differences (1 point). The evidence is sufficient for the Han, but the only valid piece of evidence for Rome is the statement that “He [Augustus] defeated Cleopatra and Mark Anthony making sure that Rome is politically secured” (1 point). Most of the Roman evidence is prior to 31 B.C.E. and therefore did not earn credit. The essay has a valid direct comparison in the fourth paragraph: “The size of both empires was an issue that led to leaders ultimately losing political control of both empires” (1 point).