|  |
| --- |
| **Close Read: Dred Scott v. Sandford**  |
| **CR**Objective  | *What did the ruling in the Dred Scott case mean for African Americans in 1857?*  |

Directions: Analyze the timeline below by answering the two questions that follow.

**Contextualization: Document 1 - Timeline of Slavery & associated acts - 1600 - 1850**

|  |
| --- |
| 1600 1619: Jamestown, Virginia - 20 Africans are sold into slavery 1694: Rice cultivation is introduced into Carolina. Slave importation dramatically increases 1775: Slave population in the colonies is nearly 500,000 - in Virginia the ratio of free colonists to slaves is nearly 1:1 1787: the US constitution is written - including the 3/5 compromise, which outlines that slaves are to count for 3/5 of a person for representation purposes in congress 1793: Eli Whitney patents the cotton gin, making cotton production more profitable - the market value of slaves increases as a result 1794: US prohibits slave trade between the US and foreign nations. 1820: The Missouri Compromise - forbids slavery in the Louisiana Territory north of 36’ 30’’, except in the state of Missouri, Maine is admitted as a free state 1830: Dred Scott is sold to Dr. Emerson, they reside in St. Louis, Missouri  |

1. Which two crops dramatically impacted the institution of slavery in America?

1. What did the Missouri Compromise say about where slavery was legal?

Directions: Read the primary source below, and answer the three analysis questions that follow.

**Contextualization: Document 2 - *The Dred Scott Case* - NY Times December 25, 1856**

|  |
| --- |
| ***The Dred Scott Case*** The case of Dred Scott, which has just been argued at length before the Supreme Court at Washington, involves principles of great political as well as legal importance. As the facts may not be in the minds of all our readers, we copy the following clear statement of the case from a Washington letter: “Dr. Emerson, of the U.S. Army, took with him from Missouri a slave named Dred Scott, as a body servant, to a military post at Rock Island, in the *State of Illinois*. After remaining there for *two years*, he removed to Fort Snelling\*, which post is north of the line of *36°30’*. At this last post, a slave woman, brought there by Major Tallafero, and owned by him, was married to Dred Scott and they had two children, one of whom was born at this post, and another after the parties had returned to Missouri. Neither of these slaves [Dred Scott or his wife] were ever set free by their owners. But, under the Constitution of *Illinois, Slavery is prohibited*, and Dred Scott could have asserted his right to freedom in that state….The second posting in Fort Snelling was a territory in which slavery was prohibited by the Missouri Act of 1820. Scott and his wife were sold by their owners to Sanford, against whom the suit was brought for their freedom. Scott claimed that having been voluntarily carried by his owner into a free state, and having been their servant, he was upon his voluntary return with his master, to Missouri, a free man there, in virtue of his temporary residence in a free territory. The same claim was made on behalf of his wife. The Missouri court decided against Dred Scott to the claim, on the ground that temporary residence in a Free State did not make them free in the state of Missouri, unless their owners had signified by some act and intention to free them from slavery by taking them into a free territory - which did not appear to be a fact in this case. Dred Scott appeals to the United States Supreme Court. Scott’s claim to freedom rests upon two grounds - first that he was taken voluntarily by his master into a state whose Constitution prohibited slavery [Rock Island, Illinois]; and resided there for two years; second, that he was afterwards taken into a territory from which, by act of Congress, slavery had been expressly prohibited [Fort Snelling]...It will be seen that if the Supreme Court sustains the right of congress to prohibit slavery in a territory, and also holds that the master lost his right of property by taking the slave into a Territory where slavery could not legally exist, both Scott and his wife must be decided to be free….The question which this involves is substantially whether any state has the right to abolish slavery - or whether slave property is so recognized and protected by the Constitution of the United States that it cannot be outlawed by states laws…” *\*Note: Fort Snelling is located in present day Minnesota*  |

1. In which state was Dred Scott originally serving Dr. Emerson as a slave?
	1. Which two locations was Dred Scott taken to where slavery was banned?
2. How does the Missouri Compromise / Compromise of 1820 impact this case?
3. According to the NY Times - what is the essential question this case is trying to answer?

|  |
| --- |
| **Close Read: Dred Scott**  |
| **CR**Analysis Task  | *What did the ruling in the Dred Scott case mean for African Americans in 1857?*  |

**Directions:** Using information from the documents, you will now write a response to thetask with regards to excerpts from the documents provided above.

**Task:** Using the information from the documents above, and your knowledge of US History complete the following writing prompt:

|  |
| --- |
| Read the [excerpt from Chief Justice Roger B. Taney’s ruling on the Dred Scott v. Sandford](#nnxfk6bnbj73) case. Imagine it is 1857, and you are a journalist writing for the *“New York Star Daily News”.* You have been assigned by your editor to write an article on the ruling of the Dred Scott case. * Explain the context of the case
	+ What is the history behind the case? What are the details of the case?
* Analyze & explain the final ruling by the Supreme Court (written by Chief Justice Taney)
	+ What does his ruling mean for African Americans living in the United States in 1857?
 |

* **explain** means “to make plain or understandable; to give reasons for or causes of; to show the logical development or relationships of”
* **analyze** means “to determine the nature and relationship of the component elements”

[Excerpt of Chief Justice Roger B. Taney's Ruling in Dred Scott v. Sandford](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/aia/part4/4h2933t.html) (1857)

The question is simply this: Can a negro, whose ancestors were imported into this country, and sold as slaves, become a member of the political community formed and brought into existence by the Constitution of the United States, and as such become entitled to all the rights, and privileges, and immunities, guaranteed by that instrument to the citizen?

The words "people of the United States" and "citizens" are synonymous terms, and mean the same thing. …They both describe the political body who ... form the sovereignty [source of power], and who they are those who hold the power and conduct the Government through their representatives - the Congress, the president, etc. The question before us is, whether the class of persons described in the plea in abatement [people of African ancestry] compose a portion of this people, and are constituent members of this sovereignty? We think they are not, and that they are not included, and were not intended to be included, under the word "citizens" in the Constitution, and can therefore claim none of the rights and privileges which that instrument provides for and secures to citizens of the United States. On the contrary, they were at that time considered as a subordinate and inferior class of beings, who…had no rights or privileges but such as those who held the power and the Government might choose to grant them.

...The court thinks [Dred Scott] could not be a citizen of the State of Missouri, within the meaning of the Constitution of the United States, and, consequently, was not entitled to sue in its courts... the language used in the Declaration of Independence, show, that neither the class of persons who had been imported as slaves, nor their descendants, whether they had become free or not, were then acknowledged as a part of the people, nor intended to be included in the general words used in that memorable instrument….