

AS

History

Paper 2J America: A Nation Divided c1845–1861
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

AS History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1861

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context which of these two sources are more valuable in explaining the reaction to the Dred Scott decision? | [25 marks] |
|----------|----------|--|-------------------|

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- | | | |
|------------|--|--------------|
| L5: | Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. | 21-25 |
| L4: | Answers will provide a range of relevant of well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. | 16-20 |
| L3: | The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. | 11-15 |
| L2: | The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. | 6-10 |
| L1: | The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. | 1-5 |
| | Nothing worthy of credit. | 0 |

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- The source is from the Charleston Mercury (South Carolina), this is a Southern newspaper which displays a very favourable reaction to the Dred Scott decision.
- The tone is celebratory, for example, its title talks of the 'Tremendous Consequences'.
- The tone shows strong partisan dislike of the Republican Party.

Content and argument

- The article states that the Dred Scott decision is correct and justified.
- Argues that the anti-slavery movement and Republican Party's arguments have been destroyed by the decision.
- Argues that the Supreme Court is final and indisputable.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the Dred Scott decision was welcomed in the South, where it was seen as a clear sign that the Constitution was on the side of slavery and that the Missouri Compromise was unconstitutional. This was seen as opening up all territories to the expansion of slavery
- the case was about a slave named Dred Scott, it stated that Scott as a slave could not sue for his freedom as he was not a citizen and that his master was entitled to take Scott into any territory in America.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source as an explanation, students may refer to the following:

Provenance and tone

- This is an extract from a book considered to carry great weight as it is written by Thomas Hart Benton, a respected Democrat politician who had been one of the party's leading figures for a long time.
- The tone is formal, presenting Constitutional argument against the Dred Scott decision.

Content and argument

- Benton argues that the Dred Scott decision is not justified in extending the Constitution into the Territories.
- Benton also argues that any legal provision relating to slavery rests with the states rather than the Supreme Court or other federal bodies.
- Benton believes that there is still room for further argument which differs from the view of Source A which sees the decision as final.

Contextual knowledge should be used to assess the validity of these points, for example:

- the Dred Scott decision brought an angry reaction from the opponents of slavery and was seen as evidence of 'Slave Power'.
- the fact that the decision opened up the Territories to slavery essentially undermined earlier compromises.
- the power to make the decision lay with Supreme Court alone.

In arriving at a judgement as to the relative value of each source, students may conclude that (e.g.) Source A is more subjective than Source B and the motivation of the writer is known from the provenance, which does appear in the highly positive picture of the Dred Scott decision, as opposed to a more reasonable Benton. Benton is shown in Source B as having fully disagreed with the decision, but it does provide rather more depth of argument on the decision than does Source A. Whilst Source B is valuable evidence of the reaction of those who opposed slavery, Source A is a clear reflection of the South's reaction to the decision and may be argued to be of more value as it shows how the South believed that they and not the North had the Constitution on their side. Any supported argument as to relative value should be fully rewarded.

Section B

0 2 'Economic differences were the major cause of division between the North and South by 1850.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that economic differences were the major cause of division between the North and South by 1850 might include:

- the Southern economy was largely agrarian based on the growing of cotton, tobacco and sugar. In contrast the Northern economy was increasingly industrial. The North was much more urbanised (1 in 4 living in towns compared to 1 in 14). The South was reliant on the North for finance, markets to sell produce and vessels for export
- the differing nature of the economies led to the desire for differing economic policy, e.g. the North wanted protective tariffs to ward off European competition whilst the South wanted free trade
- the Northern economy was based on free labour, whilst the Southern economy was based on slave labour. There was an argument about which was the more efficient method and which offered greater protection to the workers
- the economy in the South was planter-dominated whilst the Northern economy was much more egalitarian.

Arguments challenging the view that economic differences were the major cause of division between the North and South by 1850 might include:

- the issue of slavery did cause division but this was a moral not economic one for the abolitionists in the North and defenders of slavery in the south
- the issue of Westward expansion and potential extension of slavery was key to growing division, especially with the new territories acquired by victory over Mexico
- the growing disparity in terms of population led to Southern fears of Northern dominance. Much division was based on the issue of 'states rights'
- division was the legacy of the past for example the Missouri Compromise and Nullification Crisis.

Students may conclude that there were very different economies developing in the North and South and this did create division, however there were also other causes of division and these also played a key role. At a high level students may conclude that slavery was central to the division but that this was a partly economic and partly moral issue. They may also conclude that the economic differences were likely to cause disagreement but the extent of this disagreement would vary depending on world prices of crops such as cotton and the context of other issues such as westward expansion.

0 3 'Bleeding Kansas' was the most significant event in the de-stabilisation of relations between the North and South in the years 1850 to 1856.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6-10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1-5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that ‘Bleeding Kansas’ was the most significant event in the de-stabilisation of relations between the North and South in the years 1850 to 1856, might include:

- Kansas was flooded by pro-slavery voters from Missouri. Kansas became a symbol of the wider tension
- the outbreaks of violence in Kansas increased tension and the belief that compromise was no longer possible
- the reaction Northern journalists, who blew out of proportion the ‘sack’ of Lawrence by a pro-slavery posse
- ‘Bleeding Kansas’ raising John Brown to national attention
- ‘Bleeding Kansas’ became a rallying cry for those who opposed what they believed to be ‘Slave Power’.

Arguments challenging the view that ‘Bleeding Kansas’ was the most significant event in the de-stabilisation of relations between the North and South in the years 1850 to 1856, might include:

- other issues that hardened attitudes such as the publishing of Uncle Tom’s Cabin and (1852) ‘Bleeding Sumner’ (1856)
- the issue of the potential annexation of Cuba and the ‘filibuster’ expedition caused a great deal of tension (e.g. Lopez expedition 1850)
- national political factors such as the emergence of the Republican Party (1854–6), and the split in the Democrats (1856) played a key role in increasing tension between North and South
- the actions of southern political leaders and calls for secession de-stabilised relations as did the Northern States attempts to negate the Fugitive Slave Act. (1850).

Students may conclude that the events in Kansas in 1855–6, especially ‘Bleeding Kansas’, were highly significant in raising tension and can be seen as the first violent actions of the Civil War. Kansas became a stage on which the wider tensions were played out, the strength of reaction to events especially in the North led to a de-stabilising of relations and belief in the dangers of ‘Slave Power’. At a high level students may judge that the events in Kansas, though significant, must be put in the context of other events of 1850–56 and may make a case for one of the other events being equally or more significant.