

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1877
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version/Stage: Stage 0.1

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

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

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

A-level History Paper 2J**2J America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1877****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 Compromise of 1850. | [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.

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

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

Provenance

- This speech by Daniel Webster is considered a key step in the move towards the Compromise of 1850. It followed the final speech in the Senate of John C. Calhoun. Webster, an important Northern Senator, was speaking in favour of the Compromise.
- Webster's willingness to compromise may have been connected to his ambitions of high office in the future; his name had been mentioned in connection with possible Presidential candidacy. He would require support from the North and South to gain the Presidency.
- Webster made the speech with little or no preparation and was at this time largely sustained by drugs. This is the most famous and most important of Webster's speeches but is not considered one of his best generally due to his state of health at the time.

Content and argument

- The speech stresses the need for the nation and in particular the Senate to pull together and the need to heal the wounds of division. In particular it is aiming to counter Sectionalism, which had been stoked by Southern calls for secession. There was growing fear that failure of the Compromise would lead to Secession and in these circumstances it was essential that Clay and Douglas found conciliatory voices from amongst Northern Senators.
- He warns of the potential threat to the very foundations and key institutions of America. This argument would appeal to Senators given the uncertainty of what would happen if there was a failure to reach compromise and Senators feared the collapse of the existing system.
- He states that he is willing to play his part but does not see himself as taking the lead in the move to compromise. This role was being fulfilled by Clay and Douglas, they did however, need the support of the likes of Webster who could help shift the position of some of the wavering senators towards compromise.

Tone and Emphasis

- Webster aims to persuade Senators to vote for compromise and the American people to support it. This was a key stage of the debate and Webster is looking to counter Coulhoun's speech against the compromise.
- Webster uses emotive imagery to emphasise the danger that America was in if compromise was not reached. He likens America to a ship in a storm. This fits with picture of potential danger America was in that Douglas and others were focusing on to persuade people of the need to compromise.
- The tone presents him as a patriot and humble servant of the nation. This may be seen as false humility from a man hoping to become the Whig Presidential Candidate.

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

Provenance

- The source is written by Jefferson Davis who was a rising star in Southern Nationalism at the time and who went on to be President of the Confederacy. He was widely believed to be the man who would take on Calhoun's mantle as the leader of the Southern section in Washington.
- The source is written after the Civil War and is written with hindsight by a man wanting to present his own version of the events, to defend the actions of himself and the South.

Content and argument

- Davis states that Clay (the key man behind the Compromise) was less pleased with Webster's speech than Davis was himself (as a strong supporter of slavery and the South).
- Davis states that he was asked to join the pro-compromise camp but declined.
- Davis argues that even Clay acknowledged that compromise would be temporary at that the Union faced potential conflict in the future.
- Davis is demonstrating that he never supported compromise and knew it would not succeed.

Tone and Emphasis

- The tone shows that there was 'excitement' in March 1850 surrounding compromise but he did not share it. Many in the South felt that there was not enough in the Compromise for the South and it didn't address the fundamental lack of balance between North and South.
- There is emphasis on the friendly relations between Davis and Clay, but also Davis' growing frustration with the elder statesmen's desire to put off a final settlement of the issues. He clearly sees as this being the time for the issues to have been fully dealt with.

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

Provenance

- The extract is taken from the New York Herald, which was a popular Northern newspaper and also a controversial one, in particular in its support for slavery.
- The paper was known for its sensationalist stories more than considered political comment.
- The New York Herald later became a target for Northern anger due to its stance on slavery. It cannot therefore be seen as fully representative of Northern opinion.

Content and argument

- The extract argues that the steps towards compromise were excellent news and the issue of slavery in the territories 'is set at rest in a manner satisfactory to all'. Students may comment on how valid this is based on there being notable opposition to the Compromise.
- The sectional divisions are blamed on 'the ultras and fanatics of different sections of the Union'. These are clearly subjective terms being used to emphasise the case for compromise.
- The extract points to the land acquired in the Mexican War as being a key aspect leading to Sectional tension, this was clearly the case in the debate on the extension of slavery.

Tone and Emphasis

- The source is celebratory in its tone, fitting for those who supported compromise but many believed the issues had not been resolved.
- The emphasis is that compromise is good news and that sectional division highly damaging. This was certainly a view held by many but in the North there was much anger especially over the Fugitive Slave Law.
- Those in favour of compromise are portrayed as 'friends of the Union' and those who opposed it as 'fanatics and ultras'. This language is clearly aimed to persuade those who didn't support the compromise.

Section B

0 2 'Unresolved issues in the American Constitution were significant in creating sectional tension in America by c1845.'

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 unresolved issues in the Constitution were significant in creating Sectional tension might include:

- the compromises over slavery laid out in the Constitution were never likely to last and satisfy both the opponents and supporters of slavery
- the Constitution was not fully clear in terms of the long term future of slavery and in particular its extension as the Union grew
- the provision for the return of Fugitive Slaves was legally contradictory with the rights of property, clashing with the rights to freedom and for states to make their own laws
- the Constitution had left a tension between those who wanted a strong executive and those who wanted an emphasis on States' rights.

Arguments challenging the view that unresolved issues in the Constitution were significant in creating Sectional tension might include:

- the growing economic and social differences being key to the growing sectional tension
- the status quo created by the Constitution being shattered by Westward expansion and in particular the new territories acquired by victory over Mexico
- tension was created by the issue of slavery which was more divisive due to the growth of abolitionist movements in the North combined with the massive growth of the slave population in the South compared to earlier periods
- tension was a legacy of the past in terms of the Missouri Compromise, the Nullification Crisis and southern fears of modernisation.

Students are likely to conclude that the Constitution did fail to resolve the issue of slavery in the long term and also left open a debate over the degree of Federal and state power. The combination of these unresolved issues were significant in the sectional tension but so were the events both in the years preceding 1845 but also the Mexican War and western expansion. At a high level students may conclude that the unresolved issues in the Constitution were the seeds of the sectional tension in the 1840s, however the growth of American territory and the debate on the extension of slavery into these new territories was the most significant catalyst to sectional tension.

- 0 3** How significant were the Union's superior resources to their victory in the Civil War? **[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 the Union's superior resources were significant in their victory in the Civil War might include:

- the Union population was 2.5 times bigger than that of the Confederacy, this was particularly significant in a drawn out war which increasingly became a war of attrition
- the Union had three times the railway capacity of the Confederacy; this meant that they had a key logistical advantage
- the North's industrial production was nine times higher than that of the South, meaning a massive advantage in weaponry and munitions
- emancipation brought fresh troops to the Union army.

Arguments challenging the view that the Union's superior resources were significant in their victory in the Civil War might include:

- mistakes made by the Confederacy were they could have seized advantage, for example failing to press home the victory at First Manassas and poor leadership at Vicksburg and Gettysburg
- political leadership was key, with Lincoln proving much more effective in leading and motivating his people than Davis
- military leadership in the Union Army brought about victory; most notably that of Grant and Sherman
- the Confederacy adopted the wrong tactics. It can be argued that greater use of guerrilla warfare or a more defensive strategy would have been more successful.

Students may conclude that the victory of the Union happened for a range of reasons and that their superior resources were significant amongst these reasons. They may conclude that the superior resources combined with the attritional nature of warfare in the Civil War appeared to make Union victory inevitable. At a high level students may discuss the combination of political and military leadership compared to the impact that resources had during different parts of the war.

0 4 'The KKK resistance to Radical Reconstruction in the years 1867 to 1876, was responsible for its failure.'

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 the KKK resistance to Radical Reconstruction in the years 1867 to 1876, was responsible for it failing might include:

- by 1870 Forrest claimed there were over 5000,000 Klansmen
- the KKK gained support from all sections of the white community including people in positions of power and influence
- terrorist activities reached their peak in 1869–71, targeting Black holders of public office as well as black schools and churches
- state laws against the KKK were ineffective due to false alibis and members in juries
- KKK violence and intimidation continued after 1872, including marching in black areas and supporting Democrat speakers at political rallies.

Arguments challenging the view that the KKK resistance to Radical Reconstruction in the years 1867 to 1876, was responsible for it failing might include:

- the 1870–1 Congress passed three Force Acts to tackle the KKK and Grant imposed martial law in parts of the South. This resulted in hundreds of suspected Klansmen being arrested and reduced Klan terrorism
- republican in-fighting notably between scalawags and black members damaged Reconstruction
- republican economic policy was held as a being responsible by many for the depression which started in 1873
- Democrats had taken control in a large number of Southern states in the years 1869 to 1875, effectively ending Radical Reconstruction in these areas
- new paramilitary groups emerged in the 1870s, such as the Red Shirts and White Leagues, which prevented black voting. Unlike the Klan these groups were able to drill and parade openly without the threat of imprisonment.

Students may conclude that the KKK did a huge amount of damage to the process of Radical Reconstruction especially in the years 1867 to 1871, a period during which the KKK's use of terror was at its height. It continued to damage Radical Reconstruction in the years 1872 to 1876 despite strong Federal action, as it received support throughout the white community including amongst those in positions of influence in the law and politics. As the power of the Republican Party diminished in the South as the Democrats took control in an increasing number of states, so did the 'need' for the KKK. The KKK was also, to a degree, replaced by new organisations such as the White Leagues as the 1870s developed. At high levels students are likely to compare a range of reasons for the failing of Radical Reconstruction.