



A-level HISTORY 7042/2J

Component 2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1877

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

196A7042/2J/MS

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, i.e. if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Component 2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1877

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying reasons for the defeat of the Confederacy. **[30 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1-6**
- 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.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Lee was the key General of the Confederate army and so in a unique position to explain the reasons for Confederate defeat, making the source valuable
- the speech is an emotional one being given immediately after surrender, at this moment Lee will have been reflecting on why the Confederacy lost, adding value to the source
- the speech was made to Lee's own men, given this audience he is not going to point fingers or criticise their efforts, this may limit the value of the source
- the tone is affectionate and grateful, demonstrating the bond between the General and his men; this is valuable in suggesting that a lack of unity was not a reason for Confederate defeat.

Content and argument

- the source states that the Confederate army lost despite 'unsurpassed courage and fortitude', suggesting that the Confederate troops gave everything they could and should not be blamed for defeat. This is valuable and accurate in reflecting the efforts of the majority of Confederate soldiers who fought bravely but ignores the growing number of desertions that happened towards the end of the war
- the source argues that the Confederates lost due to 'overwhelming numbers and resources.' This is valuable as it reflects the statistics that showed the Confederacy were vastly outnumbered (22 million against 9 million of whom over 3.5 million were slaves) and resources (factory production 14:1, firearms production 32:1)
- he surrendered to avoid 'useless sacrifice'. This is valuable in that Lee had become wary of leading his army to more 'useless sacrifice' following Picket's Charge at Gettysburg
- the Confederate army lost despite remaining united and devoted. This is valuable in giving Lee's view on a much debated issue as to whether the Confederacy lost the will to fight in the years 1864–5 and became divided. The fact that half of Confederate soldiers were killed or seriously injured suggests, as Lee argues, that they remained devoted.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Harper's Weekly was a Northern publication that will give an insight into why the people of the Union believed they won the war. The publication was a supporter of the Union administration, scornful of those who opposed or criticised it
- the article is published in the immediate aftermath of the defeat of the Confederacy, with Lee having surrendered the Army of North Virginia 10 April and of Mosby's Raiders 21 April, giving it value in terms of the feelings of the time
- the purpose of the article is to encourage the Northern audience to celebrate the achievements of their leading General. This is valuable in giving insight into the fact that there was some disquiet about the methods used to win the war, it can however, be viewed as war time propaganda
- the tone is one of unadulterated praise for Grant, championing his contribution. This is valuable as it matches the way history has viewed Grant whilst illustrating that not everyone felt this way at the time.

Content and argument

- the source argues that Grant chose the best route to Richmond, demonstrating his great insight and leading to victory over Lee. This view can be supported and regarded as valuable as Grant inducing Lee into a war of attrition at Petersburg helped secure victory and insure Union victory. The view however can be challenged and seen as limited as in 1865 Grant was moving away from Richmond rather than towards it
- Grant was a man of great character; whilst he is viewed as a great General, this argument may be considered limited as Grant, both as a General and as President, did much to suggest he wasn't a man of great character, for example his Presidency was blighted by scandals such as the Credit Mobilier and as a General he can be blamed for Union defeat at the Battle of Shiloh
- the source states that 'Timid folk and traitors' call him a butcher – they are wrong. The source here is clearly partisan and therefore to a degree limited, especially given the way Grant treated Lee and his men after they surrendered. Students may argue that it is valuable giving an insight into the tactics used by Grant, notably Sherman's march through Georgia which saw massive destruction and caused a great deal of anger
- winning the war lead to terrible sacrifice. This is certainly true and a valuable insight into the costs of the war in terms of casualties suffered by the Union, according to even the lowest estimates about 620,000 men lost their lives in the American Civil War meaning more Americans died in this war than in any other war before or since
- the source argues that the Union won due to greater numbers – this is valuable and certainly was a key contributing factor with the Union outnumbering the Confederacy 22 million people to 9 million (of whom only 5.5 million were white people).

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the author, General William T Sherman, played a key role in the Union defeat of the Confederacy. As a leading Union General his view will be valuable in showing how the Confederacy was defeated
- the source is written about the famous 'March to the Sea' which had a crippling effect on Confederate morale, making it valuable in giving insight into how the Confederacy was defeated
- the source was published long after the Civil War, giving Sherman the advantage of hindsight adding value but also a purpose defending his and his fellow Generals reputation, which may limit its value

- the tone of the source is highly respectful of the Confederate Generals and soldiers; this is valuable in suggesting that the Confederacy were a strong and tough opponent.

Content and argument

- the source argues that the Confederate Army contained Generals who 'we had been taught to admire' and 'experienced soldiers like ourselves'. This is valuable in showing the strength of the Confederate army and is certainly true regarding Generals, such as Lee, who had an air of invincibility in the early stages of the war defeating much bigger Union forces such as the Battle of Chancellorsville
- the source also states that the Confederate soldiers were 'brave, confident, and well equipped'. Whilst it is true that the Confederate troops continued to show bravery, the value of the view that they were confident and well equipped can be questioned as the Confederate morale collapsed and resources became increasingly sparse, as demonstrated by Union soldiers sharing their rations with Confederate troops at the end of the war and the fact Confederate troops deserted in large numbers towards the end of the war due to lack of rations
- the argument that the Confederate Army had the advantage of fighting on their own land and that the Union Army had long supply lines is valuable as the Union was fighting deep inside Confederate territory, however, the account does not fully match the reality given the Union dominance of key transport routes, including rivers and massive advantages in manpower
- the value of the argument at the end of the source can be challenged as evidence strongly suggests that the Union had a great deal more 'brute force' than the Confederacy in terms of men and industrial muscle (factory production 14-1 in favour to the Union, iron production 15-1 in favour to the Union, Total Population 2.5-1). The 'March to the Sea' saw the Union army forage and leave a trail of destruction, suggesting that 'brute force' did in fact play a key role.

Section B

- 02** 'Westward expansion before 1854 was totally disastrous for the relations between slave and non-slave states.'

Assess the validity of 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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that Westward expansion before 1854 was totally disastrous for the relations between slave and non-slave states might include:

- the Mexican War that enabled Westward expansion was often referred to as ‘Polk’s War’ and was seen as an expansionist war in favour of the South and expanding slavery. The South strongly supported this whilst the North didn’t, creating disastrous sectional tension
- the addition of land outside the Louisiana Purchase in the South (notably from Mexico) led to a response from the North, notably through the Wilmot Proviso, highlighting Northern unease at the addition of land. The Wilmot Proviso created a great deal of anger in the South, demonstrated by Calhoun’s Southern Platform
- the fact that Polk pursued land beyond what he pledged in his platform in Mexico, whilst falling short of his pledge on Oregon, creating tension between the sections and promoting the idea of a slave power conspiracy and highlighting that Westward expansion had a disastrous impact on relations between North and South
- the ongoing tension after the 1850 Compromise focusing on the issue of popular sovereignty, as highlighted in debates over Kansas and Nebraska and the territories taken from Mexico, emphasise the disastrous impact of Westward expansion on sectional relations.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Westward expansion before 1854 was totally disastrous for the relations between slave and non-slave states might include:

- the Missouri Compromise successfully dealt with the issue of expansion into the Louisiana Purchase from 1820 to 1848. The 1850 Compromise attempted to mitigate the tension created by the gaining of territory from the Mexican War, suggesting that Westward expansion was not totally disastrous
- Congress voted to add Texas to the Union in 1845, which included the adding of territory won from Mexico to the Union, this suggests that Westward expansion was not disastrous
- the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was accepted by the Senate, showing support for the addition of territories from Mexico – received support from the North and the South and was not disastrous for the USA
- Westward expansion was a popular idea with a great deal of support in North and South for Manifest Destiny; it was the issue of slavery that caused division not expansion.

Overall, students can argue for or against whether Westward expansion was totally disastrous for the USA. In arguing that it was disastrous, students may point to Westward Expansion and, in particular, territory being added from the Mexican War creating a high level of sectional tension. Westward expansion was closely linked with the issue of slavery during this period, making the decision on slavery’s position in new territory highly controversial. Students, in arguing against the statement, may state that it was not Westward expansion itself that was disastrous but instead it was slavery. Students may equally argue that although there was tension created by Westward expansion in this period it was not disastrous as compromises were found.

- 03** How important was the political impact of the Kansas-Nebraska Act in the rise of the Republican Party in the years 1854 to 1860? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that the political impact of the Kansas-Nebraska Act was important in the rise of the Republican Party in the years 1854 to 1860 might include:

- the Kansas-Nebraska Act meant that the issue of the expansion of slavery became the forefront in Northern politics which helped the emergence of the Republican Party in the North as they opposed the expansion of slavery, which was a popular view at the time
- the Kansas-Nebraska Act severely damaged the Whig Party which failed to offer a definite policy on the act which left room for the new parties, such as the Republican Party to emerge
- the fact that Democrat Stephen Douglas was behind the Kansas-Nebraska Act meant that many in the North who opposed the act looked for an alternative party and many turned to the Republican Party
- the Know Nothing Party that benefited most immediately from Democrat unpopularity in the North in 1854, failed to take a strong stance on Kansas-Nebraska as it attempted to win votes in both the North and South.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the political impact of the Kansas-Nebraska Act was important in the rise of the Republican Party in the years 1854 to 1860:

- the rise of the Republicans was helped by the failings of the Know Nothings as nativism declined in the mid-1850s. The Know Nothings failed to make good on their election promises and were increasingly seen as the Whigs in a new guise
- it wasn't until Lincoln emerged during the 1858 election and the Lincoln-Douglas debates that the Republicans had a candidate likely to win the Presidency
- 'Bleeding Sumner', in May 1856, caused many in the North to sympathise with the Republican Party and was seen as proof of a slave power conspiracy as was the Dred Scott case in 1857.
- the 1856 election was the breakthrough for the Republican Party – John C. Fremont winning over 1.3 million votes and 114 Electoral College seats, coming second to Buchanan. This election showed the Republicans were a serious political force capable of winning a Presidential election.

Overall, students can argue for or against Kansas-Nebraska being important in the rise of the Republicans. In arguing in favour, students may point to the rise of the Republicans being dependent on Kansas-Nebraska bringing the issue of the expansion of slavery to the top of the political agenda in the North. Students may also argue that the Act damaged or split all other political parties whilst giving the Republicans a clear focus and policy aim. Students may alternatively look at other explanations for the growth of Republican support, such as key individuals like Lincoln, failure of the Know Nothings or Whigs or events such as 'Bleeding Sumner' or the election of 1856.

04 How far had Radical Republicans achieved their aims by 1877? **[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 very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It 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 relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** 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, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer is 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/factors suggesting that Radical Republicans had achieved their aims by 1877 might include:

- helped ensure the end of slavery and the creation of the Freedman's Bureau
- the success of the 1866 election and use of majority afterwards to over-ride Johnson's veto
- the number of black votes in 1868 (estimated 700,000) that won the election for Grant and led to the election of black representatives at state and national level
- the passing of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments
- the Passing of the Force Acts to enable President Grant to tackle the KKK in the early 1870s.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Radical Republicans had achieved their aims by 1877 might include:

- the failure of Radical Republicans to impeach President Johnson
- the corruption and inefficiency of Reconstruction tainted the ambitions of, and support for, radical Republicanism
- the South being 'redeemed' in the late 1860s and early 1870s (Tennessee in 1869, North Carolina 1870, Texas in 1873 etc.) demonstrated the failure of radical Republicans to have a lasting impact in the South
- early impetus was lost as the leaders of the radical Republicans aged and died, e.g. Thaddeus Stevens (died 1868) and Charles Sumner (died 1874), Benjamin Wade (lost his seat in 1868).

Overall, students can argue for or against the radical Republicans achieving their aims by 1877. Some may focus on the impact that they had in ensuring the end of slavery and securing citizenship for African-Americans. They may also look at the remarkable short-term impact as demonstrated by the number of black voters in 1868 and election of black representatives. On the other hand, students may argue that the Radical Republicans action ended in failure as the South is 'redeemed' and black rights are quickly eroded.