

**MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2014 series**

**9769 HISTORY**

**9769/57**

Paper 5g (Special Subject: The Origins and Causes of the American Civil War, c.1820–1861), maximum raw mark 60

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2014 series for most IGCSE, Pre-U, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Pre-U – May/June 2014	9769	57

1 (a) How far are the views on slavery as expressed in Document B corroborated in Document D? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues should be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. Where appropriate, the answer should demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation and awareness of provenance by use not only of the text, but of headings and attributions.

The dates (1850, 1858) are important here as are the provenances; much changed across those years and attitudes hardened, so **B** reflects the optimism of 1850, the year of the Missouri Compromise, when middle-ground, moderate opinions were still able to fashion a settlement that might hold, while **D** reflects how far that settlement was breaking down or had broken down by 1858. The tone of **B** is ameliorative, conciliatory, hopeful; that of **D** hostile, condemnatory both of the Dred Scott Case outcome and the aims of the Southern Slave States. **B** would see no ill, no wrong, no badness; **D** sees much that is cunning and unseemly in conduct by the Southern States.

Language tone in both can be commented upon. **B** does express the hope that, while division is a danger, there can be avoidance of such, but **D** believes the danger is great and all because of the attitudes and goals of the Southern States, whereas **B** believes the latter could be ameliorated by careful Northern management and timely concessions. **B** says that agitation can cease; **D** says that it is growing, worsened by the Southern States.

(b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that relations broke down in the 1850s because grievances between North and South were too deep-seated? [20]

The answer should treat the documents as a set and make effective use of each although, depending on the exact form of the question, not necessarily in the same detail. It should be clear that the demands of the question have been fully understood and the material should be handled confidently and with a strong sense of argument and analysis. Good use of supporting contextual knowledge should be demonstrated. The material deployed should be strong both in range and depth. Critical evaluation of the documents is to be expected. The argument should be well constructed. Historical concepts and vocabulary should be fully understood. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations is to be expected.

**E** provides a useful overview, linked to the idea of underlying, ‘deep-seated grievances’, such that were embedded, stubborn, inherent in both the South and the North. Thereby links can be made to the other documents here, with **A** and **B** representing the hopes of and for compromise, workable solutions, the avoidance of crisis and conflict, focused on the issues of new lands and their status. Contextual knowledge of the nature of the 1850s Compromise, the roles of middle-ground opinion (Clay, Calhoun and others) and the imminence of trouble in 1850 can be used. But the hopes soon evaporated; it never looked likely to last in the way of the earlier 1820 Compromise. The date of **C** is important: within a year of the Compromise, the Southerner praises the settlement but also voices criticisms, in a context of sectional tensions – tensions which grew in the coming years. **D** represents a strong, determined Northern view, seven years later, focusing on the perceived aims of the Southern Slave States and pointing to their de-stability impact. By then (1858), tensions had grown to heights that suggested possible conflict; reference could be made to the Kansas-Nebraska Act and crisis, ‘Bleeding Kansas’, the Dred Scott Case and the changing party political alignments. **E** refers to the sectionalism of the 1850s and the growth of the Republican

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>57</b>

Party's appeal; reference can be made to the collapse of the Whigs, the divisions of the Democrats and the sharpening divide over slavery (reflected in **D** also).

The optimism of 1850–51 (**A**, **B**, some of **C**) had been dissipated by 1858 and a sense of imminent conflict was apparent. By then, 'Slave Power', the Abolitionists, the 'Fire-Eaters' were all active features and there was much made of alleged conspiracies. The Lincoln-Douglas Debates of 1858 might be adduced; so too, the John Brown Raid of 1859 and its impact. Candidates will need to consider perceptions, misunderstandings, misrepresentations and how far there were innate grievances and tensions in 1850–51, but postponed by the Compromise then, or how far the tensions arose much more with and after 1854–56 (or so). In this sense, **C** can be read and interpreted at several levels. Powerful personalities, more entrenched opinions, growing North-South differences (economic, social), States' rights, the status of new territories, the effects of short-term economic crisis around 1856–57, the importance of the 'peculiar institution' of slavery, Southern elites' perception of a Northern conspiracy to eradicate slavery, Northern mistrust of Southern intentions (here **C** and **D** are useful), the removal of the great compromisers such as Clay, all could be used to advantage, linked to the documents. There is scope for argument and counter-argument here; the tone of documents **B**, **C**, **D** can be involved in analysis and evaluation also.

**2 To what extent did westward expansion divide the North and South in the period c. 1820–50? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative or description of events and features will not adequately answer the question; analysis and evaluation are required, supported by a range of examples from the period. The period is bounded by the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and its replacement in 1850; sectional tensions will feature, episodic but partisan and at times bitter. The issue of the status of new territories – free or unfree, non-slave or slave – is at heart here, linked to the prevailing Constitutional doctrines and notions of slaves as property and States' voting rights as well as the Southern fear of being outvoted by more 'free' states.

Reference will be made to new areas opened up, settled, applying for membership of the Union – Missouri, Arkansas, Texas, New Mexico, California – and to the importance of the Mexican War (1840–50) sparking as it did a major crisis. The Wilmot Proviso, Calhoun Doctrine and eventual Clay-inspired Missouri Compromise will feature, linked to electoral politics, the Presidents (e.g. Polk, Taylor) and Congressional tensions, prior issues (including the importance of the Nullification Crisis) and the attitudes of such as Jackson when President can be engaged. The links of slavery as a care issue to wider political, constitutional arguments and the growing differences (economic, social) between the North and the South can be made. The question requires westward expansion to be assessed alongside a range of other factors (economic, social, political, even party-based).

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation ('To what extent...') opens up argument and counter-argument, the assessment of several factors, their ordering, a sense of

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>57</b>

relative importance but also of connections. Here there is scope for debate, not least over the issues of lands and slavery, but connections exist to other aspects. It could be argued that westward expansion was emotive because of a bundle of other sectional differences and tensions; or that it was divisive because of periods of weak, even indecisive, Presidential leadership.

**AO3** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**3 How significantly did the party system change between 1828 and 1858? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative or description of party political changes will not go far here unless there is a very good level of explanation. Analysis and explanation are required, with a suitable range of illustrative details.

The question is bounded by the election of Jackson in 1828 and the events of 1858, including the Douglas-Lincoln debates, the stronger emergence of the Republicans and the growing inner Democrat tensions. In part, this will involve consideration of the reasons for the rise of the Republican Party but the focus is not exclusively there. Reference to some key presidential elections and presidencies is expected. The Second Party System of Democrat and Whig will be examined; the appeal, support and strengths. Also the reasons for the collapse of that system and the period of fluidity in the early to mid 1850s will be considered. Attitudes and activities inside and outside Congress can be assessed, not least as to national or more sectional stances and positions.

Broadly, while parties drew on levels of national, not sectional, support and voters placed loyalty to party ahead of sectional, there was no severe North-South divide. But that changed in the early 1850s and candidates may consider whether party changes led or mirrored wider social, economic and political changes. Lands, slavery, economic structures, States' rights will feature as some of the core issues. Religious affiliations, attitudes towards immigrants, notions of popular power and sovereignty had important effects at key junctures, not least in the late 1840s and early 1850s. Earlier, tariffs, commerce, the nature of government (federal, limited, etc) had importance, and some of the issues surfaced in the 1850s, albeit in a changing context. Reference can be made to electoral practices (caucuses, conventions, nominating methods) as well as franchises, to socio-economic factors (rural, urban, old and new wealth, etc), to Congressional issues.

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. 'How significantly...' invites a review of factors and issues; there will be a sense of relative importance, but awareness also of connections. To an

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>57</b>

extent, the issues will be placed in the context of the imminent Civil War, though this is not a question about the causes of that war. There is scope for debate and argument: for example, how far the shifts reflected changes in political society; how far there were underlying tensions, not least on the Democrat side, ready to surface in the increasingly febrile atmosphere of the 1850s; how far the parties were truly representative, how far they contained either the seeds of their collapse or the basis for growing confrontation. Some linkage to congressional politics would be useful.

**AO3** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**AO4** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.

**4 ‘The Dred Scott Case (1857) made conflict between South and North certain.’ How far do you agree with this view of the period 1857–61? [30]**

Candidates should:

**AO1** – present a response to the question which displays accurate and relevant historical knowledge. A sharp focus on the demands of the question is required. No set response is to be expected; it is the quality of the argument and evaluation that should be rewarded. A narrative of events in the late 1850s through to the outbreak of war in 1861 will not go very far, unless there is good explanation embedded. Analysis and evaluation are needed here. Candidates need to assess the importance of the Dred Scott Case in its judgement against other factors that increased sectional tensions and embittered North-South relations, culminating in the secession votes, the failure of compromise efforts and the events at Fort Sumter.

The Dred Scott Case will need some explanation and some contextualisation; reference to the issues over new territories and their status, to the centrality of slavery, to the Kansas-Nebraska Act will be in order. Then it has to be established whether the case triggered conflict or was but one factor in the development of conflict. Sectional tensions were certainly much heightened by 1850–60. Reference can be made to issues such as the reactions to the case, the Douglas-Lincoln debates, the Congressional elections of 1858, the place and actions (or otherwise) of Buchanan, the growth of the Republicans and the splits within the Democrats, the John Brown Raid, the hardening of attitudes (Abolitionists vs. Fire Eaters), the key events of 1860, Lincoln’s election, the moves to secession, the attempt at belated compromise (Crittenden), the creation of the Confederacy and the response in the North, the first shots. The importance of attitudes, perceptions, misrepresentations will be seen by good candidates as will the dominance of vocal, powerful minorities in the South and the North (reference to ‘Slave Power’, ‘Black Republicans’, etc.)

**AO2** – be able to demonstrate an understanding and awareness of historical concepts, enabling them to present clear, focused and analytical explanations which are capable of weighing up the relevant and relative importance of factors and approaches, and arriving at a well considered set of judgements. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. The question formulation sets up argument and counter-argument here. There is much scope for debate, possibly reflecting the range of historians’ views. Some argue that Dred Scott heightened tensions such that no compromise was possible; others that the John Brown Raid was critical; yet that minority opinions, prejudices, irrational fears all mattered. Long-term and short-term (trigger) factors were involved and some

<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>Pre-U – May/June 2014</b>	<b>9769</b>	<b>57</b>

argue that the changed party political system was a key factor, others that Lincoln's election was bound to create unbearable tensions. Then again, it could be argued that there was still time to save the Union but Buchanan's tenure until January 1861 represented lost opportunities. At heart will be arguments surrounding slavery, economic issues, States' rights, sectionalist attitudes and representations.

**A03** – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

**A04** – write in a coherent, structured and effective way. The writing should show a sense both of organisation and direction, displaying clarity, balance and – especially in stronger candidates – fluency. Candidates will not explicitly be penalised for specific deficiencies in spelling, punctuation and grammar. However, the cumulative effect of substantial problems in this area will inevitably influence judgements concerning the overall clarity and effectiveness of the presentation.