

**UNIT 2****DEPTH STUDY 7****THE CRISIS OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC c.1840-1877****PART 1: SECTIONAL DIFFERENCES AND THE ROAD  
TO CIVIL WAR c.1840-1861****MARK SCHEME****Marking guidance for examiners for Question 1****Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1**

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is a single element focussed on the ability to analyse and evaluate contemporary source material in its historical context. The mark awarded to Question 1 is 30.

**The structure of the mark scheme**

The mark scheme for Question 1 has two parts:

- advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- an assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.

**Deciding on the mark awarded within a band**

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

**INDICATIVE CONTENT QUESTION 1**

*NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.*

**With reference to the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the outbreak of the Civil War.**

Candidates are expected to demonstrate their ability to analyse and evaluate a range of source material with a high degree of discrimination. Source evaluation skills should focus on discussing the strengths and the limitations of the nominated sources. To judge utility, there should be consideration of the content and the authorship of the nominated sources to discuss reliability, bias, purpose and validity, as appropriate.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the outbreak of the Civil War. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations may be made in the analysis and evaluation of the sources including:

- Source A is a speech from a leading Republican politician at the height of renewed sectional tension following the Dred Scott case and the Lincoln-Douglas debates. He eloquently describes the differing political traditions and cultures of north and south, making clear the long standing unease of American leaders with the institution of slavery. He castigates the recent attempts at compromise which fail to address the fundamental incompatibility of slavery and free labour. The source is typical of the arguments advanced by the radical wing of the Republican Party and, although biased, it is reliable and accurate evidence of these beliefs. An historian would be aware of this bias and also Seward's ambitions as a senior member of the party.
- Source B is a contemporary record of the reasons advanced by South Carolina for its secession from the Union. The source makes clear the irritation with campaigns against slavery and its potential incitement of mutiny amongst slaves. However, the most powerful part of the document is the identification of Lincoln's election as a unifying factor for those states who wish to retain slavery. The context of sectional differences, the abolitionist movement and Lincoln's election is very useful to the historian who would be aware of the source's inherent bias in favour of slavery, evidence by its language and tone which equates slaves with property, abolitionism as agitation and a new President as hostile for slavery. Nonetheless it is powerful evidence of the mind set of southern secessionists in 1860.
- Source C is a private letter from President-elect Lincoln to a prominent colleague, William Seward. Lincoln makes it clear he is firmly against the extension of slavery in new territories but he is dismissive of the issue of fugitive slaves and so long as the southern states are not outrageous in maintaining slavery he does not want to interfere. Answers may pick up on the contrast with the viewpoint of Source B on this point. The nature of the source, a private letter, offers accurate evidence of Lincoln's views at that particular time. The context is the unfolding of secession with Lincoln desperate to maintain the union and not to appear, publicly at this stage, to be too critical of the institution of slavery. The language and tone provides clues to Lincoln's viewpoint and his repeated emphasis on firmness in rejecting compromise on the extension of slavery. An historian would assess the source as valuable in understanding Lincoln's thinking at a crucial point in the events leading to the outbreak of war; it is a private letter to a close colleague and offers an accurate and reliable guide to Lincoln's motivation in early 1861.

Overall, candidates should provide an assessment of the value of the sources to an historian studying the outbreak of the Civil War. They are able to demonstrate that value through consideration of the content, context, language, tone and limitations of the presented sources.

**ASSESSMENT GRID FOR QUESTION 1**

Target: AO2

Total mark: 30

Focus: *Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and / or contemporary to the period, within its historical context*

| <b>Band</b>  | <b>Mark</b>  | <b>Descriptor</b>  |
|--|--------------|--|
| <b>6</b>   | <b>26-30</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>demonstrate sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of the content and authorship of the source material</i></li> <li><i>provide sustained focus on evaluating the sources in the context of the specific enquiry</i></li> <li><i>offer a sustained judgment regarding the value of the sources for the specific enquiry</i></li> </ul>             |
| <b>5</b>   | <b>21-25</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>demonstrate a clear and accurate focus on the analysis and evaluation of the content and authorship of the source material</i></li> <li><i>provide a mostly clear focus on evaluating the sources in the context of the specific enquiry</i></li> <li><i>offer a valid judgment regarding the value of the sources for the specific enquiry</i></li> </ul> |
| <b>4</b>   | <b>16-20</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>demonstrate valid analysis and evaluation of the content and authorship of the source material</i></li> <li><i>place the sources in the context of the specific enquiry</i></li> <li><i>offer a clear judgment regarding the value of the sources for the specific enquiry</i></li> </ul>  |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>11-15</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>demonstrate some appropriate comments regarding the analysis and evaluation of the content and authorship of the source material</i></li> <li><i>make an attempt to place the sources in the context of the enquiry</i></li> <li><i>offer a limited judgment on the value of at least two sources</i></li> </ul>   |
| <b>2</b>   | <b>6-10</b>  | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>comprehend and extract information from the sources with some reference to the authorship of the provided material</i></li> <li><i>make a limited attempt to place the sources in the context of the enquiry</i></li> <li><i>offer a limited judgment on the value of at least one source</i></li> </ul>   |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>1-5</b>   | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>comprehend and extract from some of the source material</i></li> </ul>   |
| <b>Award 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers</b> |              |  |

## Marking guidance for examiners for Question 2

### Summary of assessment objectives for Question 2

Question 2 assesses assessment objective 3. This assessment objective is a single element focussed on the ability to analyse and evaluate how and why different historical interpretations have been made. The mark awarded to Question 2 is 30.

### The structure of the mark scheme

The mark scheme for Question 2 has two parts:

- advice on the specific question outlining indicative content which can be used to assess the quality of the specific response. This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.
- an assessment grid advising which bands and marks should be given to responses which demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 3.

### Deciding on the mark awarded within a band

The first stage for an examiner is to decide the overall band. The second stage is to decide how firmly the qualities expected for that level are displayed. Thirdly a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

**INDICATIVE CONTENT FOR QUESTION 2**

*NOTE: This content is not prescriptive and candidates are not expected to mention all the material referred to below. Assessors should seek to credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates. Each answer will be assessed on its merits according to the assessment grid as well as the indicative content.*

**How valid is the view that the Compromise of 1850 was doomed to fail?**

Candidates are expected to show an understanding of how aspects of the past have been interpreted in different ways. Answers will consider the provided material and use their own understanding of the historical context and of the wider historical debate in making their judgement regarding the validity of the view that the Compromise of 1850 was doomed to fail.

Candidates are invited to enter into a debate on the extent to which the Compromise of 1850 was doomed to fail. Candidates will consider interpretations of this issue within the wider historical debate about the Compromise of 1850.

- Interpretation 1 argues that the 1850 Compromise was not an overall compromise. Rather it was a series of separate votes on individual components with very few politicians actually forming a genuine coalition voting bloc. Even though it did not last, it wasn't doomed to fail.
- In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 1 answers might argue that this is a valid interpretation because it cautions against the use of hindsight in evaluating the compromise – it eventually broke down but at the time it was regarded much more positively. An intractable problem had found a solution by temporarily removing slavery as an issue. Adam Smith reminds us that the historian not only has to identify long term trends but also has to understand key developments in the context of their time, in this case the relief in 1850 that serious sectional differences had not resulted in the break-up of the union. He is a well-respected historian who has deployed carefully evidence about the complex coalitions put together in 1850 to establish some forms of compromise. This interpretation pays full attention to the role of Stephen Douglas and Henry Clay in the outcome of the 1850 Compromise.
- Interpretation 2 argues that the terms of the 1850 Compromise were not so convincingly praised at the time. It had little chance of success.
- In analysing and evaluating Interpretation 2 answers might argue that this is also a valid interpretation because Holden Reid points out that it all depended on how the northern electorates reacted and that it was a delusion to imagine that the Fugitive Slave enactment would do anything other than to antagonise those who held strong views about slavery in the north. He describes the 1850 Compromise as a truce rather than a compromise. In coming to this conclusion in the work of synthesis Reid will have integrated the views of other historians into his analysis which strongly argues that the politicians were deluded in thinking that the compromise would work.
- Candidates may show awareness of the wider historical debate surrounding this issue such as the ignition of further discontent in the north once the Fugitive Slave provisions were enacted and the views of a significant number of historians that the Compromise of 1850 was not, in fact, a compromise at all, but rather an uneasy and short-lived truce.

Overall candidates will analyse both interpretations using their own understanding of the debate over this issue, offer an evaluation of the validity of the given interpretations and provide a judgement on the issue in the question that the Compromise of 1850 was doomed to fail.

**ASSESSMENT GRID FOR QUESTION 2**

Target: A03

Total mark: 30

Focus: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted

| <b>Band</b>  | <b>Mark</b>  | <b>Descriptor</b>   |
|--|--------------|---|
| <b>6</b>   | <b>26-30</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• show sustained and accurate analysis and evaluation of provided material which is used effectively to discuss how and why different interpretations are formed</li> <li>• provide sustained focus on evaluating the interpretations in the context of the specific enquiry</li> <li>• demonstrate clear awareness of different interpretations of the issue set</li> </ul> |
| <b>5</b>   | <b>21-25</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate a clear and accurate focus in the analysis and evaluation of provided material to show how and why different interpretations have been formed</li> <li>• provide a mostly clear focus on evaluating the interpretations in the context of the specific enquiry</li> <li>• show how the issue has been interpreted in different ways</li> </ul>                 |
| <b>4</b>   | <b>16-20</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate valid analysis and evaluation of provided material to identify different interpretations</li> <li>• place both interpretations in the context of the specific enquiry</li> <li>• show awareness of different interpretations of the issue</li> </ul>   |
| <b>3</b>   | <b>11-15</b> | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• demonstrate some appropriate comments regarding the analysis and evaluation of provided material to identify different interpretations</li> <li>• make an attempt to place the interpretations in the context of the specific enquiry</li> <li>• show some awareness of different interpretations of the issue</li> </ul>  |
| <b>2</b>   | <b>6-10</b>  | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• comprehend from provided material with only limited analysis shown</li> <li>• make a limited attempt to place the interpretations in the context of the enquiry</li> <li>• show some awareness of the different interpretations of the issue</li> </ul>  |
| <b>1</b>   | <b>1-5</b>   | <p><b>Generally for this band, candidates will:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extract information from provided material</li> <li>• have some weak reference to different interpretations of the issue</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Award 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers</b> |              |   |