

# History

## Answers and commentaries A-level (7042)

### **2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845 — 1877**

Marked answers from students for questions from the June 2022 exams. Supporting commentary is provided to help you understand how marks are awarded and how students can improve performance.

# Contents

The below content table is interactive. You can click on the title of the question to go directly to that page.

<a href="#">Question 1</a>	3
<a href="#">Question 3</a>	19
<a href="#">Question 4</a>	24

## Answers and commentaries

Please note that these responses have been reproduced exactly as they were written by the student.

This resource is to be used alongside the A-level History Component 2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845-1877 Question paper and inserts.

### Question 1

With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the increasing tensions over the expansion of slavery, in the years 1857 to 1860.

**[30 marks]**

### 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**

## Student responses

### Response A

The author of the source is James Buchanan. He was the Democratic President in 1856 who was a slave owner that believed in the expansion of slavery and its preservation in the South. This is valuable as a slave owning President became President ergo displaying increase in tensions in the expansion of slavery. The date of the source is 6<sup>th</sup> March 1857. This is around the time the Dred Scott decision was being made as Dred Scott tried to sue for his freedom however this ultimately failed as the court decision was 7-2 against him. This adds value as it's at a time where the question of slavery is at it's peak. The audience of the source is the American people. More <sup>During the 1856</sup> of the American election, the American people displayed support for John C. Fremont (first Republican candidate) with 1.3 million votes. This is limited as <sup>many northern</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>states</sup> voted for Fremont.

The tone of the source is <sup>optimistic</sup> ~~cheerful~~ "cheerfully" and "caringly". Democrats felt this way as the Dred Scott decision set a precedent settling the issue of the expansion of slavery however Republicans were ~~of~~ unhappy about the decision as it overturned the Missouri Compromise. This <sup>is limited as</sup> ~~adds value as it displays~~ <sup>people didn't feel</sup> ~~the same~~ <sup>sectional</sup> differences ~~about~~ the decision.

The source argues "I will cheerfully submit to the decision of the Court". At this time, James Buchanan already knew the outcome of the Dred Scott decision due to his pressurising of Northern judges on the Supreme Court. This adds value as it displays a President intervening in the expansion of slavery.

The source argues "May we hope... the sectional Republican Party become active". This doesn't happen as the Lincoln-Douglas debates in 1858 were widely popular that placed Abraham Lincoln at centre stage as they drew crowds of up to 10,000 in some of the debates in Illinois. This then led to the Republican victory in the 1860 election (180 electoral college votes). This is limited as Buchanan is clearly wrong that the Republican Party would be "extinct".

Overall, the source is valuable. The source is valuable as the source displays increasing sectional tension due to Buchanan's intervention in the Dred Scott decision. However, the source is limited as some groups of people didn't share Buchanan's optimism over the expansion of slavery.

The author of the source is Abraham Lincoln. He is the Republican Party nominee in the 1860 election, which he eventually wins, then he's President during the first wave of secession started by South Carolina on <sup>20th</sup> December 1860. This is valuable as Lincoln has a ~~well~~<sup>detailed</sup> insight into the issue of <sup>the expansion of</sup> slavery at this time. The date of the source is 1<sup>st</sup> March 1859. This is ~~a continuation of~~<sup>not long after the</sup> the Lincoln Douglas debates in 1858 where Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas ~~debated over~~<sup>tried to win</sup> Senator for Illinois to which the issue of slavery heavily dominated the debates. This adds value as it's not long after

the issue of slavery was heavily questioned however it is limited as Lincoln is only seen as being reactionary due to losing the debates.

The tone of the source is <sup>hypertetical</sup> ~~realistic~~ "would lead us to". This sentiment was felt by Northerners as ~~they~~ most people were moderate & so opposed the idea of the expansion of slavery however Southerners were angry at Northern interference in slavery. This adds value as it displays increased tensions over slavery however it's clear not everyone shared Lincoln's tone.

The argument is "Douglas' doctrine of squatter sovereignty risks slavery being covertly expanded". This <sup>is what</sup> happened during the Kansas-Nebraska Act ~~in 1854~~ where Kansas and Nebraska determined the status of slavery through popular sovereignty (idea that the settlers get to determine whether they're a free or slave state). This adds value as it displays how the expansion of slavery was a predominant topic as the Kansas-Nebraska Act was in 1854 whilst this speech was in 1859.

The source argues "Our only serious danger is that we shall be led to the expansion of slavery by Douglas". Slavery doesn't expand into other territories as Southern states seceded (left) the Union started by South Carolina on 20<sup>th</sup> December 1860. This is useful as Lincoln is wrong about the direction of the expansion of slavery however it's valuable in displaying the polarised perceptions of the North and South over the expansion of slavery.

Overall, the source is valuable. The source is valuable as ~~the source~~ <sup>it is from</sup> a future President of America, someone who opposed the expansion of slavery but wanted to preserve it where it already was. However the source is limited as the tone

isn't reflected by the American people as a whole and.

The author of the source is Stephen Douglas. He was the Democratic nomination <sup>for President</sup> during the 1860 election however it was at a time where the Democrats split and the fire eaters (southern <sup>Democrats</sup> who wanted to expand slavery). This adds value as it displays how Stephen Douglas was from a party split over the expansion of slavery. The date of the source is in September 1859. This is one month before John Brown (an abolitionist (a group of people who wanted to emancipate slaves immediately)) raided Harper's Ferry between 16<sup>th</sup> - 18<sup>th</sup> October. This is limited due to it being a month before an arguably pivotal event happens due to John Brown's attempt to violently emancipate slaves.

The tone of the source is <sup>one of superiority</sup> ~~explanatory~~. "Some people believe incorrectly" and "that because that people". Douglas's assumption <sup>is</sup> that ~~that~~ <sup>northerners</sup> ~~northerners~~ believe in his ideology however, this isn't true as the North opposed the expansion of slavery at this point due to the popularity of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates. This is limited as Douglas's tone isn't reflective of the ~~the~~ Northern people.

The source says "the people of each state and Territory can through popular sovereignty, make their own laws regarding slavery". Popular sovereignty is an ideology that believed settlers in a state should decide the status of slavery however this was only used in the Kansas-Nebraska Act. The source is limited as popular sovereignty wasn't used in most states ergo doesn't show the increased tensions over the expansion of slavery.

The source says "The Constitution is the same everywhere within the United States". The US Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land that had ~~some~~ instances of slavery being mentioned such as the ~~3~~ three fifths compromise where ~~states~~ a slave would be worth  $\frac{3}{5}$  of a person in terms of taxation and representation. This is limited as this doesn't give any information on increased tensions.

Overall, the source is limited. The source is limited because Douglas's opinion isn't reflective of the ~~Am~~ North and he makes a variety of assumptions regarding the expansion of slavery. The source is valuable as Douglas was a candidate of the Democrat Party that split over the issue of the expansion of slavery.

President Andrew Johnson was the Vice President of the US until 1869 when <sup>Abraham</sup> Lincoln was ~~been~~ re-elected but assassinated before he could finish reconstruction. The Blame refers to the responsibility that Johnson has over his conflict with Congress. If anyone was to blame <sup>for</sup> ~~with~~ conflict in Congress, you would expect them to go above and beyond their power delegated to them under the United States Constitution; they would also not use the powers given to them by the US Constitution. The issue with the question shouldn't be who's responsible but what's responsible which ~~is~~ ~~absences~~ in the US Constitution & however, it's clear that Andrew Johnson ~~beats~~ ~~has~~ more responsibility for the conflict in Congress.



Andrew Johnson declared the Union restored which ~~displays~~ <sup>caused</sup> <sup>him to be blamed for</sup> conflict with Congress. In December 1865, Johnson declared the Union restored despite South Carolina refusing to accept that they were wrong to secede (leave the Union) and Mississippi refused to ratify the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment (~~freed~~ <sup>outlawed</sup> ~~slavery~~ slavery). Ergo displaying Johnson going beyond his powers as the Union wasn't restored by this point which further caused conflict in Congress in which the blame is attributed to ~~him~~ <sup>him</sup> however absent in the Constitution on this matter is at the heart of the issue.

However, Congress was right to override Presidential vetoes ergo Congress wasn't responsible to blame for conflict with Lincoln. Congress overrode Johnson's Presidential veto (bending back a law) in 1865 when Congress attempted to extend the powers of the Freedmen's Bureau. Also, they were right to override Johnson's veto on the 1866 Civil Rights Act (gave freedmen right to buy and rent land). Ergo Congress was working within its powers and can't be blamed for conflict with Johnson.

Johnson sometimes went above and beyond his powers which caused him to take the blame for conflict with Congress.

For example, Johnson went around southern states such as South Carolina and Texas, urging their state government not to ratify the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment (guaranteed African American's right citizenship rights). Ergo Johnson is acting beyond his powers as a President shouldn't interfere with the passing of Amendments so Johnson is responsible to blame for his conflict with Congress.

However, Congress were within their right to make Amendments so they can't be blamed for conflict with Andrew Johnson. Congress was right in passing the 14th Amendment (in addition to the Constitution that gave Americans born in the United States citizenship). Ergo displaying Congress working within the parameters of their power so they're not to blame for conflict with Johnson.

But Andrew Johnson failed to use his powers at times which caused him to be blamed for his conflict with Congress. For example, in the Summer of 1866, there were white riots in Memphis, Tennessee (Andrew Johnson's home state) and New Orleans, Louisiana where black people were killed. Johnson had the power to enforce the US federal troops however, he chose not to intervene until it was too late ergo displaying Andrew Johnson not using his powers bestowed to him under the United States Constitution which caused him to be blamed for his conflict with Congress.

However, Congress was within their rights to expel former Confederates which caused them to not be blamed for conflict with Andrew Johnson. For example, in 1865, Congress (the <sup>lower</sup> ~~upper~~ house is the House of Representatives <sup>and</sup> the upper house is the House of the Senate which are all elected positions) refused to accept former Confederates (a <sup>group</sup> ~~place~~ of Southern American states that seceded the Union and operated as a separate country) members such as Alexander Stephens as there was a committee (a group of people) of 9 House of Representative members and 6 Senators that refused to seat

them. Congress was working within their rights to expel former Confederate members as this is outlined under the US Constitution. Furthermore Congress aren't to be blamed for their conflict with Andrew Johnson, and instead the conflict <sup>should be blamed on</sup> is the Constitution giving them Congress the right to expel members.

In conclusion, Andrew Johnson was clearly to be blamed for his conflict with Congress due to him ~~not~~ at times not using his powers or going beyond his powers layed out in the United States Constitution. ~~How to blame~~ Congress wasn't to be blamed for conflict with Andrew Johnson due to their working within the parameters of their power given to them by the United States. However, a lot of the conflict stems from the United States Constitution's absences as well as its lagerness on issues regarding ~~reconstruction and the~~ <sup>how to</sup> what should happen to ex-Confederacy members.

#### This is a Level 4 response

The response shows an understanding of all three sources. There is a developed attempt to assess the value of the provenance of the sources in relation to the question, considering author, date, context and tone. This was successful in relation to Sources A (with some errors) and B, but the evaluation needed to be fuller in relation of Source C. There is some reference to contextual own knowledge when reaching conclusions. The response is less successful when evaluating the content of the sources. This tends to be highly selective, and lacks range of coverage. This is especially the case in relation to Sources A and B. For these reasons, this is a Level 4 response.

## Response B

Source A is an address to from newly elected President Buchanan. This is valuable. A source from the President of the United States will always be valuable because he can make changes where and how he sees fit, as long as Congress allows it, Buchanan isn't an abolitionist but is looking towards the future of America. The date is the 4<sup>th</sup> March 1857. This is valuable. The Dred Scott Case is happening around this date and it refers to slavery through Congress ~~decided~~ deciding that the 1820 Missouri Compromise is unconstitutional and that if slave owners can "take their property into any territory" then that breaks the 36°30' line through America. The audience is the Chief Justice. This is valuable. One of the highest ~~off~~ officials within the Courts of America and his ~~man~~ plus everyone else that ultimately led to the final Dred Scott decision so having Buchanan talk to them is significant because it begs the question of "could he have called their final decision".

The tone is <sup>hopeful</sup> ~~dissatisfied~~. Buchanan seems <sup>hopeful</sup> ~~dissatisfied~~ of the people because a lot of states accept Popular Sovereignty (such as Kansas and Nebraska) so their legal system making it their responsibility to sort this issue out. This is ultimately not valuable because he is only speaking from an outside perspective and



Source B is a speech from Abraham Lincoln - this is valuable. In a mere year, Lincoln will, once again, go up against ~~the~~ Douglas but this time he'll win. Lincoln's future as "The Great Emancipator" is yet to come, at this point. ~~because~~ but the Lincoln/Douglas debates were where slavery finally got truly brought up without hesitation. The ~~location~~ location is Chicago, Illinois. This is valuable. Illinois is the home state for Douglas, so Lincoln already has to try harder with Douglas having the 'home advantage' against him. Additionally, Illinois has had its ~~disputes~~ disputes within slavery. The purpose is the Lincoln/Douglas debates. These 7 debates tackled many issues such as slavery and sectional tensions, usually these issues weren't brought up a lot due to sensitising or not caring but these 2 talked about it. The goal of these debates was to be voted for Illinois representative in the senate. This is valuable.

The tone is passive aggressive. ~~There~~ This is <sup>valuable</sup> ~~not~~. This shows Lincoln's fire and passion for winning and slavery. Throughout the source he attacked Douglas in hopes the Illinois people see him the same way he does.

Lincoln says "Stephen Douglas would lead us inevitably to the nationwide spread of slavery". This is not valuable. Lincoln actually loses to Douglas here. He wins the popular vote with his 125,000 votes compared to

Douglas' 121,000 votes, however, in the House of Representatives and Senate, they favored Douglas so he won. This means Lincoln was actually wrong as Douglas' victory doesn't sound like Lincoln says it will.

Additionally ~~to~~ <sup>the</sup> States, "The Dred Scott decision could have led us to slavery being permitted across the whole union". This is ~~not~~ valuable. Once again, Lincoln over-exaggerates as the Supreme Court's ruling of "Slave owners can take their property (i.e. slaves) into any territory" and their simultaneous decision of breaking constitutionality of the 1820 Missouri compromise doesn't lead to mass slavery because radical republicans state that equality. Said after the Court's ruling that black people shouldn't be treated as equals' ~~words~~ is voided which does ~~not~~ <sup>recognise</sup> Scott's dehumanising, but is a long term ~~so~~ win.

Overall, Source B is <sup>not</sup> valuable as many aspects show the rising tensions; especially over Dred Scott. Though there are elements of AA it has non-valuable such as Lincoln's eventual loss to Douglas after his speech.

Source C was written by Stephen Douglas. This is valuable. At this point Stephen Douglas is the Representative for Illinois after beating Lincoln in the 7th debates last year. Douglas is a democrat though not pro-slavery, the 1860 Democratic Conventions prove this when William Yancy and so fire eaters storm out of the Charleston, South Carolina one to adopt a pro-slavery stance. The date is September 1859. This is <sup>NOT</sup> valuable. This was written after Douglas's US victory of the 7th Lincoln/Douglas debates. He is now the Senate representative but has not started running for president, his non-slavery platform ~~has~~ had not been seen yet nor has the Democratic Conventions even started yet. The audience are the North. This is valuable. Douglas's goal is to appeal to as many people as possible get your support (he gets 121,000 votes in the L/D debates and only 30,000 less votes than Lincoln in the 1860 Presidential election), so his stance, in a northern newspaper must be siding towards anti-slavery/abolitionist.

The tone is ~~passive~~ also passive aggressive. This is not valuable. With phrase like "...believing, incorrectly..." come off as harsh when he should be doing his best to appeal towards the Northern side. L/D votes were clearly sectional so Douglas should be trying to halt harder disputes or soften up his ~~one~~ one side.



Douglas states "Each state/territory can through popular sovereignty, make their own laws regarding slavery". This is valuable. Stephen Douglas has seen first hand the power of popular sovereignty and he believes the 36°30' line should be extended towards the Pacific Ocean. ~~Through~~ He is for many states admitting into the union evenly good split with free or slave state states so that ~~power~~ Congress/senate wouldn't be imbalanced.

He also states "The Supreme Court had decided [C:] that Territorial Legislature could not legislate in respect of Slave Property [C:] This is not true". This is valuable. The Supreme ~~Court's~~ <sup>case's</sup> ruling over Dred Scott stated that any American has the right to bring his/her property anywhere, he even about the unconstitutional 36°30' line. Douglas is claiming that the ruling leads in fact the power of ~~the~~ specific territorial ruling. This is valuable due to the public <sup>perception</sup> ~~perception~~ of the Dred Scott case and how there is clear mass outcry and panic circulating in the North.

Overall, the source is mostly valuable. Though it does have elements of non valuable such as US here towards Northern audience and the date. ~~There~~ <sup>There</sup> no the valuable elements outweigh the non.

**This is a Level 3 response**

The response attempts to assess the value of all three sources, and there is general understanding of the content of each source. There is an attempt to assess the value of the provenance of each source, considering author and some degree context and tone, but this lacks development and precise relevance. The content of the sources is evaluated, but in a general manner which, on occasion, lacks direct relevance to the specific demands of the question. The lack of a precise focus on the question limits the quality of the response.

## Question 3

'In the Civil War the North and South suffered equally.'

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

### 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**

## Student responses

## Response A

The North and South refers to the two opposing sides during the American Civil War as the <sup>Union</sup> ~~North~~ was predominantly free of slavery (except for border states that were a part of the Union and had slavery). The phrase suffered equally refers to how much damage did the North and South sustain through the American Civil War. If the North and the South suffered equally, you would expect to see both having suffered economically and socially; both the North and the South would be in the same position after the war. The question is too simplistic and is ~~factually wrong~~ as the South definitely suffered disproportionately to the North. <sup>The word equally</sup> ~~which makes~~ should be ~~disproportionally~~.

The North entered an economic boom which displays how they didn't suffer. For example, the War Department created the United States Military Railroad during the American Civil War (1861-1865) which helped transport troops and supplies and by the end of the war, it was the most prosperous railroad in the world. Northern industry also saw an increase in prosperity in their industry due to manufacturing weaponry and there was an increase in the population in every sector. Ergo not meeting my criteria at all as the North clearly prospered furthermore showing how they didn't suffer.

However, the South's economy suffered which <sup>wasn't</sup> ~~wasn't~~ equal to the North. For example, the Confederacy had spent \$4.3 billion on the war which led to an increase in food prices as well as inflation ~~which~~ <sup>which</sup> reached

9000% by from what it had been in 1861 also, income per person in the South was 40% of that in the North. Ergo displaying the South disproportionately suffering due to the Civil War.

The North saw an immigration boom which caused them not to suffer ~~the same~~ <sup>equally</sup> to the South. For example, there were 3 million immigrants moving to America in 1865-1873 however almost none settled in the South ergo displaying the disproportionate suffering between the North and the South. In 1866, a planter from Alabama persuaded 30 Swedish immigrants to work on his plantation where they'd be fed <sup>and</sup> housed. However, they all quit within a week further displaying the South being damaged by a lack of immigration. Furthermore, this shows disproportionate suffering between the North and the South.

However, the South was severely damaged by physical destruction caused by the Civil War ergo the suffering between the North and the South was disproportionate.

For example, William P. Sherman (Union General) ran a campaign in Georgia ~~in 1864~~ <sup>in 1864</sup> which caused \$100 million worth of damages which was 480 km wide. There was the taking of 5000 horses, 4,000 mules, 13,000 herds of cattle, <sup>and</sup> 9.5 million (bushels) of corn and 10.5 million tons of fodder ergo displaying economic <sup>and social</sup> suffering in the South. Furthermore, the North and the South suffered disproportionately due to the immense damage inflicted on the South throughout the American Civil War.

Whilst the North did have political divisions, this can hardly be described as them suffering which makes the North and South's suffering disproportionate. For example, William P. Sherman introduced an idea where freedmen (slaves free from bondage) would be given 40 acres of land and a mule. However this was an attempt to get rid of <sup>ex-</sup>slaves from following his army. However this was rejected and the North was divided over what to do with ex-slaves as in April 1865, in Kentucky (border state) there were 65,600 slaves which lasted until December 1865. However the solution with slaves was eventually resolved ergo displaying how the North didn't suffer from this <sup>or so their</sup> ~~cost~~ and suffering wasn't equal to the South and was disproportionate.

However, casualties in the South display how both they suffered disproportionately, not equally, to the North. For example, an 1860 census found 18% of white men between the age of 13-43 died during the Civil War ergo displaying the South being affected socially. An 1870 census found that 360,000 Southerners died during the Civil War further displaying only the South being affected socially by the war. Furthermore, it displays how the South suffered disproportionately to the ~~South~~ North.

In conclusion, the question ignores the comparison of the prosperity of the economy, immigration boom and the <sup>insignificance</sup> ~~insignificance~~ of political divisions when compared to the Southern economy being greatly damaged, the physical destruction that the South suffered from and the immense number of Southern casualties from the Civil War. Furthermore, it's displayed that the North's <sup>sufferance</sup> ~~sufferance~~ was greatly disproportionate to the South's suffering.

**This is a Level 5 response**

The introduction to the response is overly complicated, and the attempt to 'define terms' is pedestrian, but an argument is advanced in the final sentence of the introduction. It becomes clear, however, that the demands of the question have been fully understood and a balanced answer is produced. There is appropriate range of issues considered; economic and social impacts are considered with excellent supporting information and a clear judgement emerges. Occasionally, however, the answer does go beyond the expected chronology of the question, especially in relation to immigration, but there is an attempt to make this relevant.

## Question 4

To what extent was President Johnson to blame for his conflict with Congress?

**[25 marks]**

### 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**



## Student responses

## Response A

Andrew Johnson was the president of the United States of America from 1865, after Lincoln's assassination, and was tasked with taking over the presidential reconstructive policy. In relation to the question, Conflict would be a misunderstanding between Congress and the President which ultimately causes tension. If Andrew Johnson was to blame for his conflict with Congress, I would expect to see him receiving a few votes from Congress, un-co-operation on both sides and his reluctance to pass certain bills. Overall, President Andrew Johnson is to blame for his conflict with Congress as it could've been easily avoided if he had took the necessary precautions to do so.

One reason Andrew Johnson would be to blame for his conflict with Congress is because of his already unlikeable character. Johnson was described as a stubborn, racist, and very set in his ways person, meaning it would've been hard to change his mind on certain things, for example passing the bill that extended the Freedman's Bureau, which helped ~~or~~ slaves African Americans since they did not receive much help after. When ~~Truman~~ introduced the Bill to Johnson he was left with the impression that he would pass the bill however he did not. It could be said that the reason he did not was simply because African Americans protection was not a top priority to

him, as this is also seen when he vetoes the Civil Rights Bill, where he believed that moderates would side with him, however he did not understand that they too wanted to see African Americans treated fairly. This links back to my judgement, that if he had not miscalculated on his part and passed the act, tension between him and Congress could've been avoided.

However, it could be said that Johnson was not to blame for his conflict with Congress and that it was caused by his efforts to attempt to maintain the Union. This can be seen when he reinstates the Southern political leaders to their previous positions and he also reimburses all Southern land owners who owned property below the worth of \$20,000. This can be seen as him attempting to reach fairness for the Southerners in order to keep them from leaving the Union again and causing another civil war.

Furthermore, another reason Johnson is to blame for his conflict with Congress is would be the passing of the 14th amendment. The 14th amendment was introduced by Thaddeus Stevens and his original goal was for it to define equality and for it to be applied across all American citizens, including African Americans. Johnson was opposed to this and attempted to veto it, and called Stevens and Trumbull "men who did not want to see the Union united". This led

to Congress overruling his veto, and the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment was passed despite his oppositions. This links back to my criteria since Congress has already overruled 2 of his vetoes and they pass the 14<sup>th</sup> amendment <sup>over him</sup> ~~desp~~.

In opposition, it could also be argued that the cause for conflict between Johnson and Congress is the Democratic Party itself. This is because

Johnson might've been feeling pressure from his peer to pass more pro-Southern laws, for example the black codes that were passed in 1865 which ultimately <sup>meant</sup> ~~led to~~ that African Americans could not own land <sup>or</sup> vote, making it significantly harder for them to make a living outside of slavery, which would've ultimately led to them returning to their 'owners'.

In conclusion, Andrew Johnson was to blame for his conflict with Congress and this is solely based on his stubbornness, for example when he attempted to install a <sup>Supreme Court</sup> ~~minister~~ of Judge, after his powers over this had already been stripped from him, this led to his ultimate impeachment in 1868 which led to a vote of 126 - 47 in <sup>Congress</sup> ~~the House~~ of ~~the~~ only reason the impeachment failed was because he won in the House of Senate 35 - 19 by one vote.

**This is a Level 3 response**

The introduction is unconvincing and it takes some time to establish what the argument to be advanced might be. There is a full, generally precisely detailed, assessment of the mistakes and errors made by Johnson and how these led to conflict with Congress. Some of the analysis could have been developed further, especially the assertive and uncorroborated claims of Johnson as a 'racist'. Nevertheless, there is an appropriate range of issues reviewed in relation to Johnson. The major weakness of the response, however, is the failure to provide a balanced assessment, with only implicit (at best) assessment of the responsibility which might be attributed to Congress and its leaders.

# Get help and support

Visit our website for information, guidance, support and resources at [aqa.org.uk/7042](https://aqa.org.uk/7042)

You can talk directly to the History subject team

E: [history@aca.org.uk](mailto:history@aca.org.uk)

T: 0161 958 3865

Copyright © 2024 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

AQA Education (AQA) is a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334) and a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723).

Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX.

