



General Certificate in Education

A2 History 6041

Alternative T Unit 5

Mark Scheme

2007 examination – June series

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

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' 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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section C).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
- analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
- there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
- there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
- effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

C: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
 - generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2007

Alternative T: Liberal Democracies, c1787–c1939

A2 Unit 5: The Development of Democracies

Question 1

- (a) Study **Sources A** and **B** and use your own knowledge.
To what extent do these two sources agree on the limits to democracy in Britain in 1906?
(10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Extracts simple statements from the sources or refers to own knowledge to demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates explicit understanding of aspects of agreement/disagreement on the issue/event which is the subject of debate, with reference to either sources and/or own knowledge. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of similarity and difference of interpretation in relation to the debate and offers some explanation. **6-8**
- L4: Uses appropriately selected material, from both sources and own knowledge, to reach a sustained judgement on the extent of similarity and difference in interpretation in relation to the debate. **9-10**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will summarise the sources.

At Level 2 explicit understanding of disagreement is likely. **Source A** argues Britain was a 'restricted democracy' in 1906. **Source B** argues that the 1906 election brought a 'democratic transformation' and illustrated the 'system's hidden democratic virtues'. Furthermore, **Source A** points to 'franchise inequality' and only 29.7% of adults being eligible to vote, whereas **Source B** stressed there was 'household suffrage' which allowed Britain to throw out power and wealth in favour of 'the discontented poorer groups'. Own knowledge may be used to point out that only 60% of men had the vote and that this was why the Labour contingent was only 30 MPs, most of whom were dependent on the Gladstone-MacDonald Pact of 1903.

However, for Level 3 answers should understand there is some agreement between the sources. **Source A** laments the 'exclusion of women' and **Source B** also mentions the lack of female suffrage by referring to 'male household suffrage'. Furthermore **Source A** does accept Britain was a democracy of sorts ('restricted'), agreeing with the general thrust of **Source B**. Own knowledge may be linked to the relatively minor franchise restrictions on men compared to the situation pre-1884 and the fact that increasingly those elected were more representative of the populace as a whole. In 1908 the first non-landowner became Prime Minister.

Judgement for Level 4 may take the form of pointing to the different focuses of the two sources – they appear to disagree because **Source A** focuses on the extent of the franchise, but **Source B** focuses on who was elected.

- (b) Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.
 ‘Britain was neither a liberal nor a democratic country by 1914.’
 Assess the validity of this view with reference to Britain in the years 1867 to 1914.
 (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
 Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with a selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 may describe some aspects of Britain between 1867 and 1914.

Answers at Level 2 may focus entirely on the sources to provide evidence of democracy and the limits to democracy, or use their own knowledge to consider evidence of liberalism and democracy.

Answers at Level 3 should provide balance by using sources and own knowledge and considering evidence of both liberalism and democracy and the limits to liberalism and democracy.

Answers at Level 4 will show synoptic understanding, challenging arguments or showing the links between the two concepts, for example that as democracy develops, the need to respond to the wishes of the people leads to greater and greater state intervention which results in restrictions on people's freedoms.

Answers at Level 5 will demonstrate independent judgement, perhaps by arguing that Britain was neither fully democratic nor fully free, but that it was one of, if not the most, free and democratic societies in the world at the time.

A valid argument may be made using an appropriate selection of material from the following:

Evidence of Liberalism

- Freedom of speech, religion, association, Trades Unions
- Residual support for laissez-faire

Evidence of Democracy

- 1867 and 1884 Reform Acts
- 1872 Secret Ballots Act
- 1883 Corrupt and Illegal Practices Act
- 1911 Payment of MPs
- 1911 Parliament Act
- Peers versus People Elections of 1910 were won by the people
- MPs representative of the people (**Source B**)
- Government in the interests of the people – Pensions 1908, National Insurance 1911, cheap food as no tariffs
- Decline in the undemocratic power of the Aristocracy – abolition of the purchase of Commissions 1871, Civil Service Exam 1871, elected County Councils from 1888, Asquith first non-landowning Prime Minister in 1908.
- Women's suffrage – 1869 Municipal Franchise Act, 1888, women with the local franchise could vote for new County Councils and from 1892 could be elected to County Councils etc
- 1909 Budget (**Source C**)

Evidence of lack of liberalism

- Increase in personal taxation – 1894 Death Duties, 1909 People's Budget (**Source C**)
- State regulation of industry – 1906 Workmen's Compensation Act, 1908 Eight Hour Act
- National Insurance – compulsory employer and employee contributions
- Measures taken against the suffragettes, especially the Prisoners Temporary Discharge Act

Evidence of lack of democracy

- A 'restricted democracy' (**Source A**)
- Seven different franchises, residency clauses, plural voting (**Source A**)
- Exclusion of poorest men
- Exclusion of women (**Source A**)
- House of Lords rejection of Bills 1905–1911 and the 1911 Parliament Act only introduced a suspensory veto.

Section B

France, 1848–1905

Question 2

‘The weaknesses of republicanism were of little importance. The key factor was the personality of Louis Napoleon.’

Assess the validity of these explanations of the reasons for the creation of the Second Empire in 1852. (20 marks)

Questions 2-7 are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates’ responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the generic A2 Levels of Response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (without reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: *Either*

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: *Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 may describe the period 1848 to 1852.

Answers at Level 2 should consider the weaknesses of republicanism.

Answers at Level 3 should offer balance by considering the personality of Louis Napoleon.

Synoptic understanding at Level 4 could be demonstrated by explaining the link between the weaknesses of Republicanism and how Louis Napoleon exploited them.

Judgement for Level 5 may involve arguing that the strengths of Louis Napoleon meant he could have created the Second Empire regardless of the weaknesses of republicanism.

Weaknesses of republicanism

- Inability to manage an electorate with universal suffrage
- The loss of support as a consequence of the June Days
- The divisions in the country that the Republic could not heal (between the radical Parisians and the conservative/monarchist Provinces, the division amongst republicans between 'Reds' and the moderates, between landowners and the working class etc.)
- Failures of economic policy—taxes on land-owning classes in favour of working class, failure of '*le droit de travail*'

Louis Napoleon's personality

- Nephew and heir to Bonapartism
- Symbol of order
- Support of the army and church
- Actions in the *coup d'état* of 1851–1852 reveal political cunning e.g. avoided association with the blood letting repressions

Question 3

'The survival of the Third Republic in the years 1870 to 1905 was the result of a lack of alternatives, rather than of any commitment to republicanism in France'.

Assess the validity of this verdict.

(20 marks)

Use standard mark schemes for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6

L2: 7-11

L3: 12-15

L4: 16-18

L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Level 1 answers may describe some aspects of the Third Republic, typically the crises.

At Level 2 answers should consider either the lack of alternatives, or the strengths of republicanism.

At Level 3 answers will provide balance by covering both synoptic factors.

At Level 4 answers should demonstrate synoptic understanding, perhaps by arguing that republicanism was strong enough to defend the republic in the face of possible alternatives.

Judgement at Level 5 may take the form of arguing that the alternatives (e.g. Boulanger) never desired to destroy republicanism.

Lack of alternatives

- Divisions between the monarchist candidates created a stand off. The Comte du Combarb refused to deal with the Orleanists
- Boulanger had popular support but lacked the commitment to act
- The right was discredited by the Dreyfus Affair
- Republicanism was no more than the system of government that 'divides us least'

Commitment to republicanism

- Moderate republicanism was popular as it provided stable government
- The republicanism of influential figures e.g. Zola
- Waldeck-Rousseau's government of national defence was born out of commitment to republicanism in the face of the forces of reaction
- Paris was unyieldingly supportive of republicanism
- Supplementary elections of 1871 and subsequent by-elections meant that other than in 1871 the country had a republican Assembly and government, elected popularly
- Republicanism enjoyed the support of sufficient sections of the population albeit at the expense of the support of others – the popularity of clerical reform

Question 4

To what extent did the French state limit personal freedom and increase its control over the economy in the years 1871 to 1905? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6

L2: 7-11

L3: 12-15

L4: 16-18

L5: 19-20

Indicative content

At Level 1 answers may describe some pieces of legislation.

At Level 2 answers should offer evidence of state intervention.

To achieve balance for Level 3, answers should consider evidence of continuing personal freedom and/or economic freedom.

For a wide range of evidence at Level 4 both synoptic factors should be considered, with evidence that the state did and did not limit personal freedom and did and did not interfere in the economy. Synoptic understanding may be demonstrated by consideration of the inter-relationship of the two factors, for example that increased taxation was necessary for increased economic intervention.

Judgement at Level 5 may involve arguing that personal freedom was ensured by interfering in the economy, for example by limiting working hours

Evidence of limits to personal freedom

- Church was attacked and deprived of much of its freedom
- Dreyfus Affair

Evidence of intervention in the economy

- 1892 Labour Law cutting women's working hours
- 1881 Meline's tariff law – tariffs of between 10% and 30%
- Millerand's labour laws (social insurance, minimum wages, 8 hour day for postal workers, maximum working hours set in 1900 and 1904 etc).

Evidence of personal freedom

- Attempts to introduce income tax by the Bourgeois were defeated by the Senate
- Separation of church and state
- Removal of education from church hands
- Divorce laws

Evidence of economic freedom

- Freedom of individual enterprise – many attempted reforms were not effective e.g. women did not benefit from the 1892 law as it was not implemented e.g. limits to legislation relating to working hours

The United States, 1840–1890

Question 5

'The outbreak of civil war in America in April 1861 was inevitable'.

'The outbreak of civil war in America in April 1861 was avoidable'.

Which of these statements provides the more convincing view of the outbreak of the Civil War? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6

L2: 7-11

L3: 12-15

L4: 16-18

L5: 19-20

Indicative content

At Level 1 answers may make general statements about war being inevitable because of slavery or describe some events from 1840–1861.

At Level 2 answers should consider one of the two synoptic factors.

Answers at Level 3 should demonstrate balance by considering both of the synoptic factors.

Answers at Level 4 should demonstrate synoptic understanding, perhaps by challenging one of the factors.

Answers at Level 5 will show independent judgement, possibly arguing that nothing is inevitable and that errors by leading politicians prevented the avoidance of war.

Evidence of inevitable war

- Divisions between North and South over economic systems, the future of slavery, the future of the union
- Clashes over the extension of slavery in 1819–1820, 1840s and 1854–1856 in Kansas
- Previous attempts by South Carolina to secede hint at inevitability
- The growth of the number of free states in the Union made an election victory for a candidate with no southern support a matter of time
- When Lincoln was elected in 1860 the South was bound to act
- The only compromise that would have prevented war was allowing slavery to continue and indeed expand. Lincoln believed a ‘house divided against itself’ could not stand.

Evidence war was avoidable

- The North and South were united by common Anglo-heritage, language, Protestantism, belief in the rule of law and culture
- Rabble-rousers on both sides created the crisis, for example John Brown and Preston Brooks
- Errors by prominent politicians e.g. Jefferson Davis by his decision to attack Fort Sumter, which was the direct cause of the outbreak of war in April 1861, Calhoun for his ‘platform of the South’ and its principal of nullification, Douglas for his unwitting promotion of Lincoln and his role in the Kansas-Nebraska fiasco, Buchanan for his failure to heal the divisions in 1859–1860 etc.

Question 6

‘The political and economic gains made by Black Americans in the years 1865 to 1877 had been lost by 1890.’

How far do you agree with this view of the years 1865 to 1890? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6

L2: 7-11

L3: 12-15

L4: 16-18

L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Answers at Level 1 will assert greater freedom and rights following the civil war.

Answers at Level 2 will consider either of the two periods, or both in outline.

Answers with balance for Level 3 will consider both periods with supporting evidence.

At Level 4 answers will show a wide range of understanding by challenging both parts of the question. Synoptic understanding will be demonstrated by coverage of the whole of the period.

At Level 5 sustained judgement may argue that gains were mainly on paper and that they were not so much eroded as never fully enjoyed.

Evidence gains made by 1877 had been lost

- Blacks elected lost their seats after 1877
- Intimidation of Black voters in the south
- Decline of radical republican governments in the south by 1877
- 1883 Supreme Court threw out the 1875 Civil Rights Act

- Jim Crow Laws from 1887
- Voting restrictions in southern states – poll taxes, grandfather clauses, etc
- Southern states imposed laws requiring Negroes to hire themselves out by the year, with no right to leave employment, or to strike

Evidence gains made by 1877 continued to 1890

- 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments still existed
- Schools had been created aided by the Freedmen's Bureau and the percentage of illiterate ex-slavers fell from 90% in 1865 to 64% by 1890
- Fisk and Howard Universities
- 1872 Enforcement Act still prevented most actions of the KKK

Question 7

To what extent was the western expansion of the United States in the years 1840 to 1890 achieved at the expense of freedom and democracy? *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Level 1 answers will describe some aspects of western expansion.

At Level 2 answers will consider the costs of western expansion.

Balance at Level 3 will involve considering how freedom and democracy were advanced by western expansion.

Synoptic understanding at Level 4 may involve consideration of the inter-relationship between the expansion and freedom, movement west provided freedom for settlers, but at the expense of Native Americans.

Judgement at Level 5 may include consideration of the differences between freedom and democracy.

Evidence western expansion was at the expense of freedom and democracy

- Manifest Destiny was an ideology that justified destruction of alternative cultures
- The Indian Wars destroyed the freedom of the Native Americans, creating reservations
- Resistance led to war and the destruction of Wounded Knee

Evidence western expansion aided freedom and democracy

- Personal freedom could be related to the frontier spirit of America and the liberty inherent in the establishment of the nation
- The Mormon's trek to Salt Lake City and the establishment of Utah
- European immigrants like the Russians and Poles gained freedom in the West
- Economic freedom included the opportunity to make a fortune through the gold rushes and from cattle rearing, especially after McCoy established the great railhead at Abilene