

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

Cambridge Pre-U Certificate

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2015 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 2015 series for most Cambridge IGCSE[®], Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

® IGCSE is the registered trademark of Cambridge International Examinations.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

Special Subjects: Document Question

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2, 3 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

This question is designed largely to test skills in the handling and evaluation of source material but it is axiomatic that answers should be informed by and firmly grounded in wider contextual knowledge.

Examiners should be aware that the topic on which this question has been based has been notified to candidates in advance who, therefore, have had the opportunity of studying, using and evaluating relevant documents.

The band in which an answer is placed depends upon a range of criteria. As a result, not all answers fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases, a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.

In marking an answer examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Question 1 (a)

Band 1: 8–10

The answer will make full use of both documents and will be sharply aware of both similarities and differences. Real comparisons of themes and issues will be made across the documents rather than by separate treatment. There should be clear insights into how the documents corroborate each other or differ and, possibly, as to why. The answer should, where appropriate, demonstrate a strong sense of critical evaluation.

Band 2: 4–7

The response will make good use of both documents and will pick up the main features of the thrust of the argument (depending upon whether similarity or difference is asked) with some attention to the alternative. Direct comparison of content, themes and issues is to be expected although, at the lower end of the band, there may be a tendency to treat the documents separately with most or all of the comparison and analysis being left to the end. Again, towards the lower end, there may be some paraphrasing. Clear explanation of how the documents agree or differ is to be expected but insights into why are less likely. A sound critical sense is to be expected especially at the upper end of the band.

Band 3: 0–3

Treatment of the documents will be partial, certainly incomplete and possibly fragmentary. Only the most obvious differences/similarities will be detected and there will be a considerable imbalance (differences may be picked up but not similarities and vice versa). Little is to be expected by way of explanation of how the documents show differences/similarities, and the work will be characterised by largely uncritical paraphrasing.

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

Question 1 (b)

Band 1: 16–20

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

Band 2: 11–15

The answer will treat the documents as a set and make good use of them although, depending on the form of the question, not necessarily in equal detail. There may, however, be some omissions and gaps. A good understanding of the question will be demonstrated. There will be a good sense of argument and analysis within a secure and planned structure. Supporting use of contextual knowledge is to be expected and will be deployed in appropriate range and depth. Some clear signs of a critical sense will be on show although critical evaluation of the documents may not always be especially well developed and may well be absent at the lower end of the band. Where appropriate, an understanding and evaluation of differing historical interpretations may be expected. The answer will demonstrate a good understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary and will be expressed in clear, accurate English.

Band 3: 6–10

There will be some regard to the documents as a set and a fair coverage, although there will be gaps and one or two documents may be unaccountably neglected or, especially at the lower end of the band, ignored altogether. The demands of the question will be understood at least in good part and an argument will be attempted. This may well be undeveloped and/or insufficiently supported in places. Analysis will be at a modest level and narrative is likely to take over in places with a consequent lack of focus. Some of the work will not go beyond paraphrasing. Supporting contextual knowledge will be deployed but unevenly. Any critical sense will be limited; formal critical evaluation is rarely to be expected; use of historical concepts will be unsophisticated. Although use of English should be generally clear, there may well be some errors.

Band 4: 0–5

The answer will treat the documents as a set only to a limited extent. Coverage will be very uneven; there will be considerable omissions with whole sections left unconsidered. Some understanding of the question will be demonstrated, but any argument will be undeveloped and poorly supported. Analysis will appear rarely, narrative will predominate and focus will be very blurred. In large part the answer will depend upon unadorned paraphrasing. Critical sense and evaluation, even at an elementary level, is unlikely whilst understanding of historical concepts will be at a low level. The answer may well be slight, fragmentary or even unfinished. English will lack real clarity and fluency and there will be errors.

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

Special Subject Essays

These banding definitions address Assessment Objectives 1, 2 and 4, and should be used in conjunction with the indicative content mark schemes for each question.

Introduction

- (a) The banding definitions which follow reflect, and must be interpreted within the context of, the following general statement:

Examiners should give their highest marks to candidates who show a ready understanding of the relevant material and a disciplined management of the discussion the question provokes. They should be impressed more by critical judgement, careful discrimination and imaginative handling than by a weight of facts. Credit should be given for evidence of a good historical intelligence and for good use of perhaps unremarkable material rather than for a stereotyped rehearsal of memorised information.

- (b) Examiners should use these banding definitions in combination with the paper-specific mark schemes.
- (c) It should go without saying that any explanation or judgement is strengthened if informed by the use of source material.
- (d) Examiners are also asked to bear in mind, when reading the following, that analysis sufficient for a mark in the highest band may perfectly legitimately be deployed within a chronological framework. Candidates who eschew an explicitly analytical response may well yet be able, by virtue of the very intelligence and pointedness of their selection of elements for a well sustained and well grounded account, to provide sufficient implicit analysis to justify a Band 2 mark.
- (e) The band in which an essay is placed depends on a range of criteria. As a result, not all essays fall obviously into one particular band. In such cases a 'best-fit' approach should be adopted with any doubt erring on the side of generosity.
- (f) In marking an essay, examiners should first place it in a band and then fine-tune the mark in terms of how strongly/weakly the demands of the band have been met.

Band 1: 25–30

The answer will be sharply analytical in approach and strongly argued. It will show that the demands of the question have been fully understood and that a conscious and sustained attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. It will be coherent and structured with a clear sense of direction. The focus will be sharp and persistent. Some lack of balance, in that certain aspects are covered less fully or certain arguments deployed less strongly than others, need not preclude a mark in this band. The material will be wide-ranging and handled with the utmost confidence and a high degree of maturity. Historical explanations will be invariably clear, sharp and well developed and historical concepts fully understood. Where appropriate, there will be conscious and successful attempts to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material critically and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. Use of English will be clear and fluent with excellent vocabulary and virtually error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the other criteria for this band, limited or no use of such sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

Band 2: 19–24

The answer will be characterised by an analytical and argued approach, although there may be the occasional passage which does not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been very well understood and that a determined attempt has been made to respond to them in appropriate range and depth. The essay will be coherent and clearly structured and its judgements will be effectively supported by accurate and relevant material. Some lack of rigour in the argument and occasional blurred focus may be allowed. Where appropriate, there will be a conscious and largely successful attempt to engage with the historiography, to evaluate source material and to demonstrate an awareness of competing interpretations. The material will be wide-ranging, fully understood, confidently deployed and well controlled with high standards of accuracy. Historical explanations will be clear and well developed and there will be a sound understanding of historical concepts and vocabulary. Use of English will be highly competent, clear, generally fluent and largely error-free.

Such answers may be expected, where appropriate, to make use of or refer to at least some relevant primary sources. Nevertheless, where the answer is strong in all or most of the criteria for this Band, very limited or no use of these sources should not preclude it from being placed in this band.

Band 3: 13–18

The answer will attempt an analytical approach, although there will be passages which do not go beyond description or narrative. It will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in large part, and that a conscious attempt has been made to respond to them. There will be an effective focus on the terms of the question and, although in places this may break down, standards of relevance will be generally high. Although it may not be sustained throughout the answer, or always fully supported, there will be a recognisable sense of argument. The material will be clearly understood, with a good range, and organisation will be sound. There will be a conscious attempt to draw conclusions and form judgements and these will be adequately supported. Some understanding of differing and competing interpretations is to be expected and some evaluation of sources may be attempted but probably not in a very sophisticated form. Historical explanations and the use of historical concepts and vocabulary will be generally sound but some lack of understanding is to be expected. Use of English will be competent, clear and largely free of serious errors.

Use of relevant primary sources is a possibility. Candidates should be credited for having used such sources rather than penalised for not having done so.

Band 4: 7–12

The answer may contain some analysis but descriptive or narrative material will predominate. The essay will show that the demands of the question have been understood, at least in good part, and that some attempt has been made to respond to them. It will be generally coherent with a fair sense of organisation. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be uneven and there will be a measure of irrelevance. There will be some inaccuracies in knowledge, and the range may well be limited with some gaps. Understanding of the material will be generally sound, although there will be some lack of tautness and precision. Explanations will be generally clear, although not always convincing or well developed. Some attempt at argument is to be expected but it will lack sufficient support in places and sense of direction may not always be clear. There may be some awareness of differing interpretations and some attempt at evaluating source material, but this is not generally to be expected at this level and such skills, where deployed, will be unsophisticated. Some errors of English will be present but written style should be clear, although lacking in real fluency.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

Band 5: 0–6

The answers will respond in some measure to the demands of the question but will be very limited in meeting these. Analysis, if it appears at all, will be brief and undeveloped. If an argument is attempted it will be lacking in real coherence, sense of direction, support and rigour. Focus on the exact terms of the question is likely to be very uneven; unsupported generalisations, vagueness and irrelevance are all likely to be on show. Historical knowledge, concepts and vocabulary will be insufficiently understood and there will be inaccuracies. Explanations may be attempted but will be halting and unclear. Where judgements are made they will be largely unsubstantiated, whilst investigation of historical problems will be very elementary. Awareness of differing interpretations and the evaluation of sources is not to be expected. The answer may well be fragmentary, slight and even unfinished. Significant errors of spelling, grammar, punctuation and syntax may well hamper a proper understanding of the script.

Use of or reference to relevant primary sources is highly unlikely at this level but credit should be given where it does appear.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

1 (a) How far does Document E corroborate the views on the power of the slave states expressed in Document C? [10]

The answer should make full use of both documents and should be sharply aware of 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 sources are largely in agreement on the power of the slave States. Both consider the latter have real political power: C claims ‘the South rules’ although it does not substantiate the claim, whereas E is specific in charging the South with control of the presidency, the Supreme Court and Congress. Secondly, the South is believed to have expanded unchecked. In C, we are told the slave power had ‘a blank sheet’ to be filled as it may dictate’ and E begins with the observation that the South has advanced successively to be more impregnable than before. The power of the slave States is demonstrated by the contrast both sources make with the weakness of the North. Source C considers ‘the North falls prostrate in servile terror’ and ‘will cower and obey like a plantation slave’. This is echoed in E which argues ‘the North has been at the mercy of barbarian Southerners’ and later that ‘the Free States’ are the ‘puppets’ of the South. However, both sources agree that the power of the slave States was not invincible and popular opinion could resist their power. This is stressed in the final sentence of C with the words ‘Be it ours to proclaim’ followed by an assertion that the people should not ‘compromise with slavery’. Similarly, in E the author argues ‘The answer lies with ourselves’ and the expectation that the South will not be able to dominate indefinitely the North which is ‘superior in wealth and intelligence as in numbers’.

Evaluation of the provenance helps explain the similarities, but it also illustrates the difference in emphasis between the sources. As both are written by Northerners, candidates can rightly argue that the agreement between them is explained by their mutual common ground rooted in sectional differences between North and South. However, it is clear that the attack on slave power made by the author of C is motivated by his aim to abolish slavery above all else, given his disdain for both the North and the South and the very title of his journal. In contrast, E is clearly more concerned with the political power of the South as a threat to the North and a desire to assert northern interests as a greater priority than checking slavery. Candidates have the scope to develop this further. Garrison’s position is clearly explicable by virtue of his commitment to abolition and the audience of like-minded readers he is addressing in *The Liberator*. It is not surprising, however, that a journal, which was dedicated to monitoring the development and advancement of what it called ‘the American Idea’, might place greater stress on the state of the Union as a whole, a preoccupation which C clearly scorns in accusing the North of putting the preservation of the Union ‘above all other things’.

Comments about the background of these pieces would be helpful. Fears of slave power were heightened by the Kansas-Nebraska Crisis of 1854 when Garrison made his speech which could be linked to the reference to the South ‘cracking the whip’. Similarly, when E was written, there was civil war in Kansas and Nebraska which explains the reference to ‘the battle not yet over in Kansas’ but which further raised fears for the Union. In both sources the language is passionate, a reflection of the strength of feeling of both authors even if their perspectives were slightly different.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

- (b) How convincing is the evidence provided by this set of documents for the view that the debate on slavery was primarily an economic one?

In making your evaluation, you should refer to contextual knowledge as well as to all the documents in this set (A to E). [20]

The debate about slavery hinged on several factors and the word ‘primarily’ in the question should alert candidates to the existence of arguments in addition to the economic. A regards slavery as negative in its economic impact. The exhaustion of the soil in the South is contrasted to its original fertility and the poverty of the South is compared to the prosperity of the North. He is clear in his judgement that this was due ‘to the withering and blasting effects of slavery’. Candidates should be able to elaborate on the effects on the land of single crop agriculture whether in the tobacco or cotton regions of the South. Indeed, some will be able to provide knowledge about the fortunes of the cotton and tobacco sectors of the economy in this period, as a way of judging the strength of an economic system based on slavery. Attitudes to work are also assessed. The author bemoans the ‘indolence’ prevalent in the South in an ambiguous way which might be interpreted as a reference to the slaveholders or the slaves. Candidates might expand on ‘the common charge made against slavery’, implied in A and admitted in D, that slaveholders were idle parasites and the plentiful evidence there is of the difficulty in motivating the slaves. Similarly, support for the defence of the slaveholders presented in D could be developed by explaining how diverse the picture was concerning the energy and involvement of the slaveholders. The author of D is more specific about the economic effects of slavery to the slaves by suggesting they are better off than ‘free labourers (who) must work or starve’ highlighting the benefits of shorter working days, holidays and care throughout their lives. A effectively denies these claims by contrasting ‘the happiness and contentment’ enjoyed by those in the North with the ‘discontent and poverty’ of the South. Candidates should be able to add knowledge about the reality of plantation regimes to test the accuracy of the assertions made in A and D. Evaluation of both sources would be helpful too. The author of D appears to be objective in his assessment contrasting slavery with free labour challenging the detractors of slavery by debate and argument. However, his views are typical of those who defended ‘the peculiar institution’ and conservative views of the ante-bellum South. As a slaveholder, presumably with lands of his own, it could be argued that the author of A was in an equally good position to judge the effect of slavery on agriculture.

In addition, moral arguments were central to the debate about slavery. C asserts slavery was a denial of freedom. It castigates ‘every slaveholder as a man-stealer’ and ‘the preservation of slavery’ as ‘paramount to all other considerations’. The tone and implication of ‘a new atrocity’ and ‘to crack the whip’ suggests that slavery was based on brutality. The demand for ‘Liberty for all’ emphasises how the enslaved were deprived of their freedom. The moral imperative of this piece is at the core of C which states categorically that ‘In no way is slaveholding right or justifiable’. These points might be supported in knowledge about the nature and operation of slavery in the South and the efforts made by the South to defend the ‘institution’ of slavery with the Fugitive Slave Law, for example. The author’s narrow focus might be explained as the idealism of a campaigner dedicated to a cause and especially the founder of *The Liberator* (1831) who was instrumental in establishing the abolitionist movement and who worked for the cause until it succeeded. Some might regard his speech as typical of a self-righteous bigot as, indeed, slaveholders were inclined to do.

Less obviously, A also implies that slavery was immoral because it denied those in the South ‘the happiness and contentment’ enjoyed by those in the North. Some might assess the sincerity of the author in his concern for the wellbeing of slaves. He may have returned some of his slaves to Liberia but that implies he retained others. Did he release only those from whom he had nothing further to gain? This is an opportunity for candidates to comment on the ‘Back to Africa’ movement.

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

A also highlights another factor of debate. His reference to ‘the derision and discontent’ of the South reflects an awareness of the potential conflict inherent in slavery as an institution. Concern about the social dangers of slavery is unsurprising given the Nat Turner uprising of 1831 in Virginia. Indeed, candidates may know that other slave ‘rebellions’ had occurred earlier, notably the Vesey conspiracy in South Carolina in 1822. No wonder he concludes his speech by denouncing the division of ‘one-half of its inhabitants ... against those of the other half’. Both B and D implicitly acknowledge this danger but claiming that slavery was a good way of social control. B explains that slavery ensures the ‘surveillance and control’ of the ‘under class’ and D refers to slavery being an ‘efficient police system’. Knowledge about the threat posed by slavery to social stability in the North and the South could be discussed. B believes the institution preserves slaves ‘from degradation’ and ‘so much good actually results to the governed’ implying that the system was socially beneficial to all. Candidates might assess the views of B as racist given the language used and those of D as theoretical given the author’s academic credentials.

There was also a political dimension to the debate. E resents the apparent dominance of southern interests over central government and the legal system, as well as the expansion of slavery beyond the Missouri Compromise into Kansas and the expectation of further advances. The very title of the article signals a sense of being overwhelmed by slavery. All these aspects could be explained with the application of knowledge and the immediate context of the Dred Scot judgement earlier in 1857. Candidates might evaluate the source as typical of a northern, partisan, viewpoint and the derogatory comments expressed about Southerners, in contrast to the arrogant claims about northern superiority, as reflective of the cultural divide. The political concerns of the article might be considered unsurprising given the priority of the journal was ‘the state of the nation’.

2 Assess the importance of tariff policy in dividing the North and the South in the period 1820–49. [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 will not be credited as much as analysis and evaluation supported by a range of examples from the period.

The introduction of a tariff in 1816 was an issue that proved to be controversial and very contentious in the period under review. It could be argued that tariff policy was extremely important in dividing the North from the South. In general terms, this was because tariffs were largely favoured by the North and opposed by the South. This was because the tariff protected industry which was located primarily in the North whereas the South, which was more reliant on imports of industrial goods, was disadvantaged by it. Debate about the tariff was central to the politics of the period, with the Democrats (strongest in the South) opposing the tariff and the Whigs and, later, the Republicans, supporting the tariff. As such, the issue was usually at the heart of election campaigns, helping to define politics in Washington. On the other hand, Southern concerns could be overstated. Initially, they favoured the introduction of a tariff. The tariff was modified (lowered) at different times and was less of a problem during the period in question than might have been the case because of the relative prosperity enjoyed by the cotton trade.

However, at specific times the issue of the tariff was extremely serious. It was at the heart of the Nullification Crisis of 1830–32 which came close to breaking the Union. Calhoun’s articulation of States Rights, the danger of secession from the Union over the ‘abominable tariff’, and the

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

likelihood of war should be assessed. Support for secession was limited to South Carolina with other Southern states openly opposed to the idea whilst Jackson was steadfast in defence of the Union. The Force Bill of 1833, which resolved the crisis, might be cited as evidence for the depth of the crisis or prove that it was exaggerated. A less dramatic point of tension was the mid-1840s at the point at which Texas joined the Union. Opposition from the Northern states to Texas was in part motivated by the concern that the State would tip the balance in favour of the Southern States and lead to the end of the tariff.

Then, as at other times, the other key issue dividing the North from the South was the practice of slavery. Tensions were increased throughout the period by the expansion of the Union, and how to accommodate new states, notably Texas becoming a state in 1845, the problem of lands acquired from Mexico leading to the Compromise of 1850. Divisions were also amplified by the emergence and development of the abolition movement from the 1830s which candidates might analyse. There is much scope to explain the attitudes and perspectives of both sides and so highlight the gulf in principle and character that divided them. Some candidates may explore the importance of States' rights as a factor dividing North and South, perhaps underpinning the debate over both the tariff and slavery.

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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. The history of the tariff and the problems it caused between the North and the South should be the focus of candidates' answers. The question restricts their scope to the period 1820–49 so candidates should restrain from straying into the 1850s; selection of material will be an important criteria to judge. Better answers will examine the negative effect of tariff policy and also recognise the danger of overstating its impact. Other factors in dividing the North from the South should be considered, but their importance should be assessed relative to that of tariff policy; some sense of weighting of the factors identified is desirable. Indeed, candidates may suggest links between factors. In presenting such an analysis, candidates should be in a position to reach a logical judgement about the importance of tariff policy in its broader context.

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

AO4 – write in a 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 be explicitly 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 To what extent, and why, had social and cultural differences between the North and the South widened in the period 1820–61? [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 descriptive run through of a range of characteristics will not be credited as much as analysis and evaluation of the features that distinguished the North from the South. Further, awareness of change over time is expected and an assessment of the degree to which the difference between North and South had widened. The differences are primarily economic, social and cultural although political differences might be considered.

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

Most candidates are likely to place emphasis on the fact that slavery was the main point of difference between the sections. Consideration should be given to the central importance of the 'peculiar institution' to the South compared to the pre-eminence of the notion of 'free labour' operating in the North. Positions and attitudes to slavery hardened over the period. Reference to the increasingly defensive position of the South on slavery and the growth of the abolitionist movement in the North would be helpful. Discussion of the Fugitive Slave Law and its application would also be useful to emphasise the widening of the gulf between the sections. This might be extended by emphasising the South's dependence on agriculture in contrast to the industrialisation of the North. Those that discuss these economic factors to explain the differences are likely to highlight the rural nature of Southern society compared to the urbanisation of the North and how industrial growth widened the gap between the two over the period.

Other social and cultural differences could be assessed. The social inequality of the South may be contrasted with the greater egalitarianism of the North. Likewise, the conservative and insular attitudes of the South might be set against the more liberal and open attitudes further North. The North welcomed immigrants who ensured a more mixed and diverse society which contrasted with the closed and, to a degree, racist society of the South. The increase in immigration into the North over this period helps explain the widening of the gap between the sections. Social and cultural differences were exacerbated by the political differences between North and South. Candidates might refer to the contrasting positions of the sections on matters such as the tariff, the future of the territories and issues such as States' rights, for example.

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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations (although not required) may well enhance responses as will an ability to engage with controversy. Candidates should do more than explain the relevant characteristics by which the North and South differed or present them as if the contrast between North and South was stark or clear cut.

There is scope to examine the material in various ways. The link between economic and social factors could be explained. Regional differences within both North and South could be assessed, if only to demonstrate how different were the North-eastern seaboard and the interior in the North, and how the States just below the border differed from the Deep South in the southern section, although internal divisions were even more complex. It could be argued that economic divisions can be exaggerated, given the relatively small scale of industrial enterprises and the large numbers who lived and worked on the land in the North. Similarly, even attitudes to slavery were not universally different with many Northerners supportive of it and, indeed, there were abolitionists in the South. However, despite the similarities, candidates might be aware of change over time and how the differences between North and South became more pronounced between 1820 and 1861. This can be demonstrated with reference to the economic, social, cultural and political positions of both sections in this period.

A03 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

A04 – write in a 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 be explicitly 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.

Page 12	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

4 Why did some states secede from the Union in 1860–61?

[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 or description of events will not be credited as much as analysis and evaluation supported by a range of examples from the period.

A range of factors should be considered. Some may focus on the events of the four months of the Secession Crisis, 1860–1. As such, emphasis will likely focus on the election of Lincoln and Southern fears that he would abolish slavery to explain the secession of South Carolina in December 1860. Further discussion of the tension between North and South in the final months of Buchanan’s presidency can be expected. The Fort Sumter Crisis deserves examination to explain the subsequent secession of other southern states. Answers restricted to these events will lack the depth of analysis required.

In addition, consideration of the more substantial political, economic and social reasons for secession is expected. Politically, Southerners felt patronised by the North and treated as inferior partners in the Union. The theory of States’ rights and a desire for independence was strong in the South and the Crisis of 1860–61 presented the opportunity for them to exercise these rights. Candidates could track this theme from the debate on the addition of Missouri, the Nullification Crisis, the status of Texas, Kansas and Nebraska to the climax of 1860–61. Economically, the South had long complained that protectionist trade policies were detrimental to their interests and that the expansion of slavery was frustrated by Northern opposition. To emphasise this point, candidates might assess the Kansas-Nebraska Crisis, for example, but also the ambitions of some in the South to expand into the Caribbean and Central America. Many believed that a break with the North offered the prospect of economic growth and prosperity. Secession might also be regarded as a way of preserving Southern society and civilisation. For many, their way of life was worth defending and faced with the perceived threat to it between November 1860 to April 1861, they were prepared to secede.

Better candidates will be aware that there were shades of opinion in the South and that they were divided amongst themselves. At the moment of secession, the Upper South did not secede. Further, it could be argued that secession was fuelled by radicals who did not represent the majority view but whose enthusiasm generated a momentum that was difficult to control. Indeed, it could be argued that the consequence of the resort to arms was not fully appreciated by the protagonists and that secession only occurred as an unexpected effect of it.

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 factors and approaches and arriving at a well-considered judgement. Where appropriate, attempts to deal with historiography, critical evaluation of source material and differing interpretations may well enhance responses but are not required. This question clearly requires consideration of the events of 1860–61, but candidates have the opportunity to distinguish between short and long term causes and so identify specific sparks that ignited the movement to secession. Candidates have scope to consider whether secession was inevitable or not and, in doing so, show their awareness of the dangers of hindsight. There is room for candidates to debate whether secession was a rational and reasoned plan or if it was a spontaneous, unplanned or even accidental outcome of misjudgement, misunderstanding and intransigence by politicians. Was secession an ambition of some States rather than all, or just a few radical politicians rather than the majority?

AO3 – [not applicable to Special Subjects]

Page 13	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	Cambridge Pre-U – May/June 2015	9769	57

AO4 – write in a 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 be explicitly 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.