

UNITED STATES HISTORY

2020 Exam

Total Time – 45 Minutes

Question 1 (Document-Based Question)

Suggested reading and writing time: 45 minutes

Suggested upload time: 5 minutes

It is suggested that you spend 15 minutes reading the documents and 30 minutes writing your response.

Directions: Question 1 is based on the accompanying documents. The documents have been edited for the purpose of this exercise.

In your response you should do the following:

- Respond to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis or claim that establishes a line of reasoning.
- Describe a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.
- Support an argument in response to the prompt using at least two documents, with an additional point being earned for using four documents.
- Use one or two additional pieces of specific historical evidence (beyond that found in the documents) relevant to an argument about the prompt.
- For one or two documents, explain how or why the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.
- Use evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the prompt.

1. Evaluate the extent to which the Jeffersonian Republicans remained faithful to their principles of constitutional interpretation in the years 1801 to 1817.

Document 1

Source: Thomas Jefferson to Gideon Granger, a future member of Jefferson's cabinet, 13 August 1800.

I believe [we] shall obtain. . . a majority in the legislature of the United States, attached to the preservation of the federal Constitution, according to its obvious principles and those on which it was known to be received; attached equally to the preservation to the states of those rights unquestionably remaining with them; . . . in short, a majority firm in all those principles which we have espoused, and the Federalists have opposed uniformly. . . . It [our country] can never be harmonious and solid while so respectable a portion of its citizens support principles which go directly to a change of the federal Constitution, to sink the state governments, consolidate them into one, and to monarchise that.

Our country is too large to have all its affairs directed by a single government. . . .

The true theory of our Constitution is surely the wisest and best that the states are independent as to everything within themselves, and united as to everything respecting foreign nations.

Document 2

Source: Jefferson to Samuel Miller, a Presbyterian minister, 23 January 1808.

I consider the government of the United States as interdicted by the Constitution from intermeddling with religious institutions, their doctrines, discipline, or exercises. . . . Certainly no power to prescribe any religious exercise, or to assume authority in religious discipline, has been delegated to the general [federal] government. It must then rest with the states, as far as it can be in any human authority. . . .

I am aware that the practice of my predecessors [prescribing a day of fasting and prayer] may be quoted. . . . Be this as it may, everyone must act according to the dictates of his own reason, and mine tells me that civil powers alone have been given to the President of the U.S. and no authority to direct the religious exercises of his constituents.

Document 3

Source: Alexander Anderson cartoon, 1808.



OGRABME, or. The American Snapping-turtle.

Sold for the Proprietor, by D. Longworth, 11 Park.

© Collection of The New-York Historical Society

Document 4

Source: Daniel Webster, Federalist from New Hampshire, in a speech on a conscription bill, to the House of Representatives, 9 December 1814.

The [Madison] administration asserts the right to fill the ranks of the regular army by compulsion. . . . Where is it written in the Constitution, in what article or section is it contained, that you may take children from their parents, and parents from their children, and compel them to fight the battles of any war in which the folly or the wickedness of the government may engage it? . . . Who will show me any constitutional injunction which makes it the duty of the American people to surrender everything valuable in life, and even life itself, . . . whenever the purposes of an ambitious and mischievous government may require it? . . .

If the secretary of war has proved the right of Congress to enact a law enforcing a draft of men out of the militia into the regular army, he will at any time be able to prove quite as clearly that Congress has power to create a dictator.

Document 5

Source: James Madison: Message to Congress vetoing an Internal Improvements Bill, March, 1817.

[I have] considered the bill this day presented to me entitled 'An act to set apart and pledge certain funds for internal improvements,' and which sets apart and pledges funds. . . for constructing roads and canals, and improving the navigation of water courses. . . . The power to regulate commerce among the several states cannot include a power to construct roads and canals. . . . I am not unaware of the great importance of roads and canals and the improved navigation of water courses, and that a power in the national legislature to provide for them might be exercised with signal advantage to the general prosperity. But seeing that such a power is not expressly given by the Constitution, and believing that it can not be deduced from any part of it without an inadmissible latitude of construction and a reliance on insufficient precedents; believing also that the permanent success of the Constitution depends on a definite partition of powers between the general [federal] and the state governments. . . I have no option but to withhold my signature from it . . .

APUSH DBQ RUBRIC

FOR 2020 EXAM ONLY

Name: _____

DBQ: _____

CONTEXTUALIZATION

Describes a broader historical context relevant to the prompt.

The response must relate the topic of the prompt to broader historical events, developments, or processes that occur before, during, or continue after the time frame of the question. This point is not awarded for merely a phrase or a reference.

THESIS / CLAIM

Responds to the prompt with a historically defensible thesis/claim that establishes a line of reasoning.

The thesis must make a claim that responds to the prompt, rather than merely restating or rephrasing the prompt. The thesis must consist of one or more sentences located in one place, either in the introduction or the conclusion.

DOCUMENTS, EVIDENCE, & ANALYSIS

	DESCRIBES	SUPPORTS	EXPLAINS
Doc __			
Doc __			
Doc __			
Doc __			
Doc __			
TOTAL			

Accurately **DESCRIBES** the content of **at least TWO** documents to address the topic of the prompt. Quotes are insufficient to earn this point.

SUPPORTS an argument in response to the prompt using **at least TWO (1 Pt) or FOUR (2 Pts) documents**. These documents should meet (and exceed) the standard set for the description point.

For **ONE or TWO** documents, **EXPLAINS HOW or WHY** the document's point of view, purpose, historical situation, and/or audience is relevant to an argument.

Uses specific historical evidence beyond what is found in the documents relevant to an argument about the prompt. **(one per example – up to TWO points)**

The response must describe the evidence and must use more than a phrase or reference. This additional piece of evidence must be different from the evidence used to earn the point for contextualization.

Demonstrates a complex understanding of the historical development that is the focus of the prompt, using evidence to corroborate, qualify, or modify an argument that addresses the question.

The response must demonstrate a complex understanding, which must be part of the argument and not merely a phrase or reference. This could include:

- Explaining nuance by analyzing multiple variables
- Explaining both similarity and difference, both continuity and change, or multiple causes, or both causes and effects
- Explaining relevant and insightful connections within and across periods
- Confirming the validity of an argument by corroborating multiple perspectives across themes
- Qualifying or modifying an argument by considering diverse or alternative views or evidence

TOTAL POINTS: