



A-level HISTORY 7042/2J

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

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



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 Examiner.

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

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

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, ie 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.

Section A

- 0 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 disputes over Kansas in the mid-1850s.

[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

- Sumner was a well-informed, influential politician. His speech was sure to reach a wide, receptive audience and offers valuable insight into pro-abolitionist opinion in the North
- one significant limitation is that Sumner expresses very partisan, openly provocative views. Even some in the North would have regarded Sumner and the Radical Republicans as being too extreme
- 1856 was an election year. Sumner's deliberately emotive language reflects intense hostility between rival factions (North as well as South) at a time when partisan views were accentuated
- the tone is extreme and inflammatory. Terms like 'noble cause', 'swindle' and 'reptile monster' preclude compromise and invite conflict. The tone of moral superiority was certain to provoke Southern anger and to intensify the difficulties facing those hoping for compromise.

Content and argument

- the core argument is a fierce attack on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill as a 'crime against Kansas'. Specific examples of pro-slavery violence and intimidation might be used to argue that the South was to blame for choosing to act 'forcibly' not 'peaceably'
- a key issue for Sumner is 'free soil' – the need for free land to be open to western farmers, including new arrivals – the source is valuable in highlighting this issue, but is also one-sided in its sense of outrage and deliberately provoking Southern hostility
- the source accuses the South of deliberately using local concerns in Kansas to promote and extend slavery. Assessments of the value (and/or limitations) of Source A might refer to the political tactics of the local legislature to suppress the free-soil vote
- the threat to 'establish a supremacy of numbers' was a two-edged sword – many migrants newly arrived in Kansas were free-soilers but there were also many pro-slavery men imported to boost the numbers of anti-abolitionist voters.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- this article in a Whig newspaper circulating in Boston, makes clear a particular Northern, pro-abolition viewpoint, but has limited value because it was aimed at a like-minded audience, asserting a view from a narrow standpoint, with little power to persuade
- the purpose of the newspaper article is to denounce the 'brutal' assault on Senator Sumner in Congress. This reveals the impact of a sensational event but its value is limited because it overstates the impact of a heat-of-the-moment confrontation

- the article has immediacy, soon after the assault, and aims to rally public opinion, especially in Massachusetts, against the South's 'reign of terror'. It is also blatantly manipulative and propagandistic
- though outwardly moderate in tone and language, the message is actually fiercely uncompromising; the South is characterised by 'knives, bludgeons and revolvers'.

Content and argument

- the argument is that the attack on Sumner is not a single act of outrageous violence but is part of a wider context of violent and repressive acts happening in Kansas. The implications for North-South relations are very serious. Compromise is impossible
- there is no excuse for the attack, it 'cannot be believed' that Sumner provoked it; but this might be seen as sweeping and unreliable. Many in the North thought Sumner was in the wrong, even if they also condemned the attack on him in the Senate
- conflict is coming, forced by the South: 'the sooner we in the North understand this the better'. Again, this view does not represent a balanced view of the range of opinion in the North
- assessments of the value of the source may argue that the stance of Sumner and the Radicals would have been seen by many in the North as extreme and unduly provocative.

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

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- the source provides a valuable perspective from one 'ordinary person' who has migrated to Kansas from the North; but the fact that Edward Fitch chooses to write to a Massachusetts newspaper indicates his partisan allegiance to 'free-soil'
- Fitch reports only on what's happening 'on the spot' in Kansas and avoids speculation about things he does not know; his letter has the value of a report from an informed eyewitness
- Fitch gives valuable insights into the methods of the unofficial Kansas legislature (helped by federal troops) to defend slavery
- the tone is reasoned, not often emotive or exaggerated; but it reveals Fitch's allegiance to 'Free-soil groups' and his hostility to 'pro-Slavery men' and those who facilitate them.

Content and argument

- Fitch says 'it has been much quieter here in Kansas recently'; clearly worse violence has happened previously, with political killings seen as commonplace. Own knowledge of events in 'Bleeding Kansas' since 1854 could be deployed to comment on this context
- a central theme of the argument is that US troops have favoured 'pro-slavery men'. This might be illustrated by own knowledge of repressive measures to deal with disputes in Kansas as local officials sided with 'border ruffians' to harass 'free-soilers'
- Fitch also blames pro-slavery politicians for using fraudulent tactics to push through the Kansas Bill
- another key argument is a warning about future dangers. There will be violence against men of Free States entering Kansas; and 'hundreds in Missouri' are waiting to be brought in to tip the balance in voting to keep slavery.

Section B

- 0 2** 'In c1845, the issue of States' Rights was the most important reason why divisions between North and South widened.'

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 supporting the view that in c1845, the issue of States' Rights was the most important reason why divisions between North and South widened might include:

- States' Rights was fundamental to debates over the Constitution. In c1845, almost all Southerners believed there was an urgent need to defend their rights against unjustified 'interference' by the federal government as seen in the Nullification Crisis
- the annexation of Texas in 1845, followed by the Mexican War brought the issue of States' Rights to boiling point because Texas had ambitions to take over California; this clashed with US foreign policy under President Polk
- similar tensions and controversies were exacerbated over the future of Oregon Territory
- disputes about slavery were framed by the issue of States' Rights, above all by the explosive issue of the right to secede. The Constitution was used as a vehicle for Southern grievances.

Arguments challenging the view that in c1845, the issue of States' Rights was the most important reason why divisions between North and South widened might include:

- a key cause of division was economic divergence. The rise of the industrial economy in Northern states (such as the Erie Canal and railroads) accelerated divisive demographic and social change
- plantation society and the defence of old traditions pushed Southerners into defiance and fear of future change; this widened religious and cultural divisions
- westward expansion was bound to intensify divisions as new states and territories emerged and new settlers were pulled into West by land hunger and the discovery of gold in California
- the key cause of division was slavery. Any and all Southern arguments using States' Rights to oppose federal authority or the concept of Free Soil were merely tactics to defend slavery.

Many answers will focus on the reasons why the issue of States' Rights was central to the defence of the institution of slavery and to the desire of the Southern states to maintain their political and economic traditions. Others may challenge such arguments by analysing a wide range of factors underlying the divisions. The focus of answers should be on the position in c1845; later developments are only relevant if used to reflect on the States in c1845.

0 3 'In the years 1863 to 1865, there was little progress toward national reconciliation because of the indecisive leadership of President Lincoln.'

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 supporting the view that in the years 1863 to 1865, there was little progress toward national reconciliation because of the indecisive leadership of President Lincoln might include:

- Lincoln was often cautious in policymaking, seeking consensus rather than provoking opposition. It took Lincoln a very long time to commit to the Emancipation Edict
- Lincoln was reluctant to impose presidential authority on his military commanders. This left a lot of initiative to his generals, such as Sherman, whose brutal invasion of Georgia left a bitter legacy in Southern grievances
- as the war came to an end, Lincoln was hesitant and undecided about votes for African-Americans; his proposals excluded sections of society outside freed slaves and serving soldiers. The debates over the Thirteenth Amendment were allowed to drag on for months and months. This was disappointing to Black leaders and Radical Republicans
- Lincoln spent much time thinking how to welcome the South back into the Union but, as the war ended, he still had no clear plan. Lincoln's sudden death left a vacuum allowing 'carpet-baggers' and 'scalawags' to exacerbate Southern resentments.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1863 to 1865, there was little progress toward national reconciliation because of the indecisive leadership of President Lincoln might include:

- Lincoln was a great peacemaker and consensual president. It was not his supposedly poor leadership but his murder by Southern extremists that held back the prospects for reconciliation
- the manner of the final defeat of the South led to economic collapse and social breakdown. This engendered lasting bitterness and the legend of the 'Lost Cause', making the South resistant to any moves towards reconciliation and leaving Lincoln little room for peace making
- the divisions between South and North were deep and structural, not just wartime enmities. Secession was a terminal breach. It was all but impossible to achieve any form of reconciliation quickly
- the obstacles to reconciliation were shown by the slow process of passing the Thirteenth Amendment. Lincoln had to accept big compromises to get the House to ratify it in January 1865; but it took until December 1865, after Lincoln's death, for Andrew Johnson to get some Southern states to ratify the Amendment. This was not Lincoln's fault, merely proof of continuing irreconcilable divisions.

Many answers will frame arguments for or against the view that Lincoln was indecisive. Others may deploy a range of structural factors as the key reasons why progress towards reconciliation was slow and limited, although they must consider the indecisive leadership of President Lincoln and assess the role of Lincoln as part of this.

- 0 4** To what extent did violence and the threat of violence enable Southern segregationists to regain their political dominance over the South 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 supporting the view that violence and the threat of violence enabled Southern segregationists to regain their political dominance over the South by 1877 might include:

- there was a wide range of groups such as the Klu Klux Klan who were committed to ‘white terror’. These groups quickly attracted support and were able to mount campaigns of violent intimidation. By 1870, the KKK had 500 000 members. The presence of many ex-Confederate soldiers made things worse
- white violence involved major riots, such as those in New Orleans, and widespread localised lynchings. Both were allowed to flourish by passive acceptance from the wider population. There was little appetite to enforce the law and finding witnesses willing to testify was often impossible
- the threat of violence did much to nullify the Freedmen’s Bureau and made it difficult for Republicans to campaign at elections and weakened their political position
- attempts by Republican governments at federal and state level to suppress violence were ineffectual because white violence was so widespread and often gained popular support; the longer this went on, the more difficult the problems became.

Arguments challenging the view that violence and threat of violence enabled Southern segregationists to regain their political dominance over the South by 1877 might include:

- Radical Republicanism declined sharply after 1867. It was more and more difficult for Southern Republicans to get white support
- economic problems provided grievances for Democrats and Redeemers to exploit. Post-1865 governments did little to aid economic recovery in the South. African-Americans were forced into share-cropping. The 1873 recession accelerated these trends
- Grant’s administration was marred by corruption and inefficiency. This led to the Amnesty Acts and the collapse of the Freedmen’s Bureau. By the 1874 elections, the Democrats were dominant
- the 1877 Compromise ended Reconstruction and left the way open for Democrats to dominate the South. Jim Crow Laws returned, with popular support. This was the culmination of a long process underpinned by deep structural trends. Violence and the threat of violence aided these trends but mostly on the fringes.

Many answers will focus on the many examples of white violence, such as the Colfax Massacre or vicious rioting in cities like New Orleans and assess the importance of this rioting for the Southern segregationist cause. Others may take a wider view of the factors that undermined Reconstruction, but they must assess the key topic of violence as part of this.