

## **2019 AP® US GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS**

3. This question requires you to compare a Supreme Court case you studied in class with one you have not studied in class. A summary of the Supreme Court case you did not study in class is presented below and provides all of the information you need to know about this case to answer the prompt.

In the 1950s, Pete Hernandez, a Mexican American agricultural worker, was found guilty of murder and sentenced to life in prison by an all-white jury in Jackson County, Texas. Hernandez's defense claimed that people of Mexican ancestry had been discriminated against in Jackson County. They pointed to the fact that no person of Mexican ancestry had served on a jury in 25 years and that the Jackson County Courthouse itself practiced segregation in its facilities. The five jury commissioners, who selected the members of the grand jury, testified under oath that they selected jurors based only on their qualifications and did not consider race or national origin in their decisions.

In the ensuing case, *Hernandez v. Texas* (1954), the Supreme Court unanimously ruled in favor of Hernandez, deciding that evidence of discrimination against Mexican Americans existed in Jackson County and that the Constitution prohibits such discrimination.

Based on the information above, respond to the following questions.

- A. Identify the clause in the Fourteenth Amendment that was used as the basis for the decision in both *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) and *Hernandez v. Texas* (1954).
- B. Explain how the facts in both *Brown v. Board of Education* and *Hernandez v. Texas* led to a similar decision in both cases.
- C. Explain how an interest group could use the decision in *Hernandez v. Texas* to advance its agenda.

---

**Begin your response to this question at the top of a new page in the Free Response booklet and fill in the appropriate circle indicating the question number.**

## **2019 AP® US GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS FREE-RESPONSE QUESTIONS**

4. The United States Constitution establishes a federal system of government. Under federalism, policy making is shared between national and state governments. Over time, the powers of the national government have increased relative to those of the state governments.

Develop an argument about whether the expanded powers of the national government benefits or hinders policy making.

Use at least one piece of evidence from one of the following foundational documents:

- The Articles of Confederation
- *Brutus 1*
- *The Federalist 10*

In your essay, you must:

- ✓ Articulate a defensible claim or thesis that responds to the prompt and establishes a line of reasoning.
- ✓ Support your claim or thesis with at least TWO pieces of accurate and relevant evidence.
  - One piece of evidence must come from one of the foundational documents listed above.
  - A second piece of evidence can come from any other foundational document not used as your first piece of evidence, or it may be from your knowledge of course concepts.
- ✓ Use reasoning to explain why your evidence supports your claim or thesis.
- ✓ Respond to an opposing or alternative perspective using refutation, concession, or rebuttal.

---

**Begin your response to this question at the top of a new page in the Free Response booklet  
and fill in the appropriate circle indicating the question number.**

**STOP**

**END OF EXAM**

# **AP® UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT AND POLITICS**

## **2019 SCORING GUIDELINES**

### **Question 3**

**4 points**

#### **Part A: 1 point**

One point is earned for identifying the clause in the Fourteenth Amendment that was used as the basis for the decision in both *Brown v. Board of Education* and *Hernandez v. Texas*.

- Equal Protection clause

Scoring Note: Due Process clause does not earn the point.

#### **Part B: 2 points**

The first point is earned for only describing a relevant fact from the required case.

- *Brown* was about segregated schools/racial discrimination in schools.

Scoring Note: The response must be a relevant case fact and NOT the reasoning, decision, or the majority opinion.

The second point is earned for correctly explaining how the facts of both cases led to a similar decision.

- In *Brown*, segregated schools led to discrimination against African American students, which was a violation of the Constitution/Equal Protection Clause. In *Hernandez*, discrimination against Mexican Americans in jury service was found to be a violation of the Constitution/Equal Protection Clause because it led to the conviction of Hernandez by a jury that excluded Mexican Americans.

#### **Part C: 1 point**

One point is earned for explaining how an interest group could use the decision in *Hernandez v. Texas* to advance its agenda.

- An interest group could write amicus curiae briefs to encourage the Court to apply the decision from *Hernandez* in similar cases.
- An interest group could lobby members of Congress to expand civil rights using the *Hernandez* case.
- An interest group could sponsor court cases encouraging the Court to apply the decision in *Hernandez*.

A score of zero (0) is assigned to an answer that is off-task or is attempted but earns no points.

A score of NR is assigned to an answer that is blank.