

Two Views, One Camp

Assess claims, reasoning, and evidence about the Bonus Army.

CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.11-12.6 "Evaluate authors' differing points of view on the same historical event or issue by assessing the authors' claims, reasoning, and evidence."

NAME _____

DATE _____

1 READ AND MARK _____ Read it twice

YOUR JOB Underline each author's main position, circle the evidence each author uses, and number the words or ideas that connect evidence to a conclusion. These marks will help you compare how the accounts explain the same event.

The Bonus Army Clearance

- ① In 1932, during the Great Depression, thousands of World War I veterans traveled to Washington, D.C., seeking early payment of a bonus promised for 1945. Many built camps along the Anacostia River and near the Capitol. On June 15, the House of Representatives approved a bill for early payment. Two days later, the Senate rejected it. Most veterans stayed in the city, hoping Congress would reconsider. In late July, federal troops, acting under President Herbert Hoover's orders, cleared veterans from several locations. Newspapers, officials, and veterans described these events in sharply different ways.
- ② In one account, a Washington reporter wrote that the removal harmed citizens who had already served their country. She described families packing bedding into wagons, veterans carrying American flags, and children watching smoke rise after troops set fire to shelters. She noted that many residents had remained peaceful after the Senate vote. Because the camp included unemployed men and their families, she wrote that force made their hardship worse rather than solving the nation's economic problem. Her account included scenes from the camp and comments from residents she interviewed.
- ③ An Army officer's written statement said troops had been sent after clashes near federal offices, where police had fired on veterans during an effort to clear occupied buildings. The officer wrote that the government had to protect public buildings and employees. He reported that troops separated crowds from government property and removed temporary shelters to prevent further disorder. His statement listed orders, locations, and the actions of soldiers. It described the camp residents as a crowd near federal property, while referring to the operation as a necessary measure for public order.

2 ANSWER WITH EVIDENCE _____ Use the passage

- 1** What position about the removal does the reporter present? Use two details from her account to support your answer.

- 2** What position about the removal does the Army officer present? Explain how the officer connects events near federal offices to that position.

- 3** How does each author use reasoning to reach a different view of the troops' actions?

- 4** Which account gives stronger evidence for a historian studying how the removal affected camp residents? Explain your choice with evidence from the passage.

3 YOUR TURN _____ Your own words

In 5 to 7 sentences, evaluate which account is more convincing on the question of whether using force against the Bonus Army was appropriate. State each author's position, use evidence from both accounts, assess the reasoning or evidence, and make a supported judgment.

PART 1 • READ AND MARK

Underline each author's main position, circle the evidence each author uses, and number the words or ideas that connect evidence to a conclusion. These marks will help you compare how the accounts explain the same event. Accept any marking that follows this job and points at the right text.

PART 2 • ANSWERS

#	QUESTION	ANSWER
1	What position about the removal does the reporter present? Use two details from her account to support your answer.	The reporter presents the removal as harmful and unjust to veterans and their families. She describes families packing bedding, children seeing smoke, and peaceful residents after the Senate vote.
2	What position about the removal does the Army officer present? Explain how the officer connects events near federal offices to that position.	The officer presents the removal as necessary to protect government property and restore order. He connects clashes near federal offices and occupied buildings to the need for troops to separate crowds and remove shelters.
3	How does each author use reasoning to reach a different view of the troops' actions?	The reporter reasons that force worsened hardship for unemployed veterans and families, so it did not solve the economic problem. The officer reasons that clashes and occupied federal property created a need to protect buildings, employees, and public order.
4	Which account gives stronger evidence for a historian studying how the removal affected camp residents? Explain your choice with evidence from the passage.	The reporter's account gives stronger evidence for effects on camp residents because it includes observations of families, children, shelters, and interviews with residents. The officer's statement focuses more on government property, orders, and soldiers' actions.

PART 3 • YOUR TURN (SAMPLE ANSWER)

For the question of whether force was appropriate, the officer offers a clear government purpose: protecting federal buildings and employees. His reasoning connects clashes near federal offices to a need for public order. However, the reporter supplies more concrete evidence about the human effects, including families packing bedding, children seeing smoke, and residents who remained peaceful. Her interviews and observations support her view that removal worsened hardship, although they mainly show the camp residents' side. Overall, the reporter more convincingly explains why the decision harmed veterans, while the officer better explains why officials believed action was needed.

Accept supported interpretations of either account if students accurately identify both viewpoints and use relevant evidence. Strong responses distinguish evidence about residents' experiences from evidence about official actions and government concerns.