



GCE AS MARKING SCHEME

SUMMER 2022

HISTORY - 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**

2100U70-1

INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2022 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

Marking guidance for examiners

Summary of assessment objectives for Question 1

Question 1 assesses assessment objective 2. This assessment objective is a single element focused 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:

- An assessment grid advising the bands and marks that should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2.
- Advice on the specific question that outlines indicative content which may 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 must credit any further admissible evidence offered by candidates.

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 band are displayed. Thirdly, a final mark for the question can then be awarded.

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:

- An assessment grid advising the bands and marks that should be given to responses that demonstrate the qualities needed in assessment objective 2
- 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.

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.

AO2: Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

		Value of the sources	Analysis and evaluation of the sources in their historical context	Focus on the question set
Band 6	26–30 marks	The learner shows clear understanding of the strengths and limitations of the sources.	The sources are clearly analysed and evaluated in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner will make a sustained and developed attempt to utilise the sources to directly answer the question set.
Band 5	21–25 marks	The learner considers the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources in the specific and wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources appropriately to support the judgement reached about the question set.
Band 4	16–20 marks	The learner develops a response which begins to discuss the strengths and limitations of the sources.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources with an awareness of the wider historical context.	The learner deploys the sources to support the judgement reached about the question set.
Band 3	11–15 marks	The learner uses most of the source material to develop a response.	There is some analysis and evaluation of the sources.	The learner begins to discuss the sources' use in the context of the question set.
Band 2	6–10 marks	The learner uses some of the source material to develop a response.	The learner begins to analyse and evaluate the sources but it is largely mechanical.	The learner attempts to comment on the sources' use but lacks context.
Band 1	1–5 marks	There is limited evidence of the use of the sources.	Sources are used for their content only.	
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.				

Using the sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the issue of slavery in the US during the period from 1840 to 1850.

Candidates will consider the value of the sources to an historian studying the issue of slavery in the US in the period from 1840 to 1850. Understanding of the historical context should be utilised to analyse and evaluate the strengths and limitations of the sources. Appropriate observations in the analysis and evaluation of the sources may include the following.

Source A The general historical context associated with this source is the institution of slavery in the southern states and the specific historical context may include reference to the abolitionist movement that began in 1833 and gathered strength in the 1830s and 1840s. This is a public debate in the Senate about the many abolitionist petitions presented to Congress at that time. Calhoun is already making clear that any move against the institution of slavery would end the Union. The importance of slavery to the South is made abundantly clear by him. Abolitionists are portrayed as fanatics stirring up unnecessary conflict. The morality of slavery is not questioned, and slavery is seen as a positive. Relations between the races are excellent if only they can be left in peace by the abolitionists. The source is remarkable for the sectional attitudes so starkly revealed as early as 1840; note the reference to “northern allies”. The language and tone betray the passion and bias of the speaker.

Source B The general historical context associated with this source is the problem of the extension of slavery in the new territories and the specific historical context may include reference to the war with Mexico and the annexation of Texas. Sumner is a leading abolitionist and his abhorrence of slavery resonates through the source. The speech is also an early indication of the fear of slave power which was to poison sectional issues until the outbreak of the civil war. It fed directly into the ideology of the Republican Party and most of the issues in the 1850s. The problem of the admission of slave states is outlined in the source. Sumner alleges that not only is the war immoral, but it is also directly beneficial to the slaveholders. The language and tone identify Sumner’s political views.

Source C The general historical context associated with this source is the campaign for the abolition of slavery and specific historical may include reference to the arguments in 1850 over the issue of slavery in the Compromise debates. The source portrays the slave society as the victim of false reports; in fact, the institution is benevolent as seen in the delightful illustrations of contented slaves. The source has numerous references to the trouble between North and south and the potential dissolution of the Union. The handbill is a propaganda device with all the advantages and disadvantages of the genre. It is persuasive in tone about the good conditions on the plantations and the ill-informed abolitionists who it suggests are responsible for fomenting all the sectional troubles.

AO3: Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

		Focus on the question set	Analysis of the interpretation
Band 6	26–30 marks	The learner discusses clearly the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner considers the validity of the interpretations in the development of the historiographical context. They demonstrate an understanding of how and why this issue has been interpreted in different ways. They discuss why a particular historian or school of history would form an interpretation based on the evidence available to the historian.
Band 5	21–25 marks	The learner discusses the question set in the context of alternative interpretations.	The learner discusses the work of different historians and/or schools of history to show an understanding of the development of the historical debate. The learner analyses and explains the key issues in the question set when considering the interpretation in the question.
Band 4	16–20 marks	The learner discusses the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is some attempt to explain why different interpretations have been formed. The learner considers a counterargument to that presented in the question.
Band 3	11–15 marks	The learner attempts to discuss the question set in the context of the development of the historical debate that has taken place.	There is a limited attempt to explain why different interpretations have been formed.
Band 2	6–10 marks	The learner is able to show understanding of the question set. There is an attempt to reach a judgement but it is not firmly supported or balanced.	The learner's discussion of the interpretation is valid, with reference to alternate interpretations.
Band 1	1–5 marks	Any judgement reached is limited and unsupported.	The learner attempts to discuss the interpretation by tending to agree or disagree with it.
Award 0 marks for an irrelevant or inaccurate response.			

How valid is the view that Lincoln was responsible for the failure to achieve compromise before the American Civil War?

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 failure of Lincoln and other politicians to compromise was mainly responsible for the American Civil War. Some of the issues to consider may include the following.

Interpretation 1

This argues that Stephen Douglas was responsible for a catastrophic error in trying to compromise on southern aspirations and northern fears. He offered what he saw as a practical solution to the problem of slavery in the new territories: popular sovereignty. He thought he could reassure the North by asserting that slavery would not flourish in such poor physical and climatic conditions for plantations. In so doing he turned a deaf ear to the noise of abolitionism and the furore over the Fugitive Slaves Act and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. The interpretation could be supported by issues such as the Kansas–Nebraska Bill and its consequences. Douglas's ability will be known because of his crucial role in formulating the Compromise of 1850. However, it is generally accepted that he miscalculated badly and instead of compromise he managed to stoke the flames of sectional differences and inadvertently created a new political party. This extract fits well into the revisionist canon of work on the causes of the civil war, which blamed the war on the blundering of politicians and the agitation of fanatics.

Interpretation 2

This argues that Lincoln refused to compromise with the seceded states. For Lincoln the integrity of the Union – and this is the nationalist theme – was everything, and the price for keeping it was going to be high. The interpretation could be supported by issues such as the election of 1860, where Lincoln's victory was sectional. The southern states saw his election as the last straw after years of dissension about the institution of slavery, which was (they thought) threatened by his election. Smith reminds us that Lincoln was under pressure to compromise with memories of 1850 in mind, but this situation was very different. Lincoln probably underestimated the strength of secession that winter, but he never wavered in his determination to keep the Union together. Smith's interpretation fits well into the post revisionist school of history, which places the issue of slavery firmly at the forefront. However, it could also link to the revisionist theme that blames the war on inept politicians who could not negotiate the issues.

Wider debate

The irreconcilable differences between the two sections were crucial to the start of conflict. The Beards stressed the economic differences, while other historians have pursued the theme of either Northern aggression or Southern aggression with violence being portrayed as a component of both societies' incapacity to resolve differences peaceably.