

AS
HISTORY
7041/2J

America: A Nation Divided, c1845–1877

Component 2J The origins of the American Civil War, c1845–1861

Mark scheme

June 2024

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.

No student should be disadvantaged on the basis of their gender identity and/or how they refer to the gender identity of others in their exam responses.

A consistent use of 'they/them' as a singular and pronouns beyond 'she/her' or 'he/him' will be credited in exam responses in line with existing mark scheme criteria.

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 © 2024 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, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining the disputes over the territories acquired from the Mexican War?

[25 marks]*Target: AO2*

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and having little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6–10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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 address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- the purpose of the platform, and indeed the Free Soil Party, was to prohibit slavery expansion into the newly acquired territories after the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was signed in February 1848. This offers value for showing Northern political attitudes towards what to do with the Mexican cession
- the date was just months after the end of the Mexican War, showing how national politics was clearly divided over what to do with the acquired land from the Mexican War. This was highlighted in the Presidential election with the Free Soil Party gaining 10% of the popular vote
- the tone is both aggressive and determined in their resistance against slavery going into the territories, which offers value as the Free Soil Party was set up by disillusioned Democrats and abolitionists dedicated to ensuring Free Soilism would spread into the new lands.

Content and argument

- the platform places blame for the sectional tensions following the Mexican War on the ‘Slave Power’ which was associated with their political rivals, the Democrats. The Mexican War had been started by aggressive expansionist President James Polk, who was widely viewed as an agent of the ‘Slave Power’: the North had repeatedly called the conflict ‘Mr Polk’s War’. The Democrats had been associated with the ‘Slave Power’ conspiracy which had increased sectional tensions
- the source also argues the federal government should protect the territories from slavery expansion and endorse the Wilmot Proviso. The Wilmot Proviso of August 1846 was a proposed amendment to the Mexican War bill to prevent slavery entering any territory acquired from Mexico, which passed in the House of Representatives with a vote of 83-64, but failed in the Senate. Voting on this bill was completely sectional
- the source concludes with the ongoing argument that the land must remain free for free labour to expand, and not slavery. Northerners had different economic ambitions with the new land, and many feared economic competition with plantation owners.

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

Provenance and tone

- the author is Calhoun, a prominent member of the Senate and an advocate for slavery expansion and states' rights. Calhoun's recent 'Platform of the South' in February 1847 had argued that Congress couldn't stop citizens taking their property into the new territories
- the purpose of the source is to force the North to yield to legitimate Southern grievances and allow slavery to enter the territories rightfully won by the South
- Calhoun's tone is sincere, as he is certain the North bears responsibility for the escalating sectional tensions surrounding the territories and it was their duty to offer a remedy for this.

Content and argument

- Calhoun argues that the North is to blame for the territorial disputes. The South resented the North's aggressive assertion over any land that the Union annexes, especially the areas coming in from the Mexican War. Students can make reference to how President Taylor had encouraged the new territories of California and New Mexico to skip territorial applications and apply instead for free statehood, which upset the South
- Calhoun continues to emphasise that the South is in serious danger if the new land is controlled by the North. The South had won the land as they contributed more to the Mexican War, and felt the North were riding roughshod over their constitutional rights as emphasised by speakers like Calhoun
- Calhoun concludes by arguing that the North must give an equal portion of the land to the South to maintain peace within the Union. Students may address value as this argument was compromised with the concept of popular sovereignty being introduced to the territories of Utah and New Mexico as part of the ongoing 1850 Compromise, whereas California would enter the Union as a free state.

In arriving at a judgement as to which source might be of greater value, students might conclude that the sources both offer value as they come from complete opposite sides of the argument in relation to the disputes over the territories acquired from the Mexican War. Source A may offer more value for demonstrating disputes on a political level, with the introduction of a new political party directly focused on the disputes over the territories caused from the Mexican War, whereas students may conclude Source B offers more value as Calhoun is speaking at a time when disputes were at their most intense following Taylor's actions and the desperate need for a compromise.

Section B

0	2	'In c1845, the Union was stable.'
----------	----------	-----------------------------------

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 Union was stable might include:

- there was political stability across the Union by c1845. Two political parties, the Democrats and the Whigs, were voted for in both sections of the Union
- there was a degree of economic stability across the Union by c1845. The majority of the American workforce remained in agriculture, with the North producing most of the food crops, such as oats and wheat, whereas the Southern farmers grew cash crops, such as cotton and tobacco
- issues surrounding slavery expansion into the territories had largely been settled. The 1820 Missouri Compromise stated that slavery could not exist above the 36°30' line, however, it could expand into areas below it. The future admissions of both free and slave states suggested stability
- threats of secession were not widely supported, suggesting strong national harmony and stability. No other Southern state supported South Carolina in talks of secession and nullification during the Nullification Crisis 1832/33.

Arguments challenging the view that in c1845, the Union was stable might include:

- abolitionists were becoming feared by the South for their open challenges to the existence of slavery. Influential writers such as William Lloyd Garrison, an abolitionist from Massachusetts, published 'The Liberator' in January 1831, which Southerners held responsible for inspiring events, such as the Nat Turner Revolt, which saw 50 women and children killed in Virginia
- Southerners continued to feel dominated in national politics. Due to increasing population growth in the North, the House of Representatives would always remain Northern dominated, causing Southerners to feel outnumbered in Congress
- there was a growing belief by c1845 of the 'Slave Power' amongst Northerners. The election of James Polk, a slave owner from Tennessee, on the platform to annex Texas and his future ambitions in Mexico emphasised this conspiracy
- there remained economic disputes between the Northern and Southern states which suggested instability. The North had strong preferences for free labour, whereas the Southern states remained conservative to their 'peculiar institution' of slave labour.

Students may argue either way with this statement. Students may argue that, by c1845, there was enough holding the Union together and it was maintaining its social, economic and political stability. There was indeed no real threat of secession and civil war by this time, as there were clearly key individuals, such as Henry Clay of Kentucky, willing to reach compromises to keep the Union together. However, students can also argue the existence of slavery was always going to cause instability between the North and South by c1845, on moral, economic and constitutional grounds.

0 3 'The main reason for increased support for the Republican Party, in the years 1857 to 1860, was the Dred Scott decision.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 main reason for increased support for the Republican Party, in the years 1857 to 1860, was the Dred Scott decision might include:

- the decision specifically declared the Missouri Compromise unconstitutional, arguing that slavery must go unchallenged into the territories. This horrified many Northerners who opposed slavery expansion, causing an increase in Republican support
- the decision also stated that African-Americans could not sue in federal court for their freedoms as they weren't citizens. This angered many abolitionists who felt the Supreme Court, especially Chief Justice Roger Taney, were demonstrating the perceived presence of the 'Slave Power'. Dred Scott had lived for long periods of time in a free state (Illinois) and a free territory (Wisconsin) therefore should have been freed, which in turn led to increased support for the Republican Party
- the decision was a major victory for the South but caused major concerns about what the Supreme Court would do next. Lincoln feared that 'the next Dred Scott decision' would see slavery enter the free states, despite their own state laws prohibiting it, increasing Republican support
- the decision was long debated after the ruling, even in the Lincoln-Douglas debates during the 1858 Congressional elections. Lincoln wanted to expose Douglas' true feelings on the decision, knowing it was an unpopular decision in the North and would push more voters into the Republican camp whilst causing more splits in the Democrats.

Arguments challenging the view that the main reason for increased support for the Republican Party, in the years 1857 to 1860, was the Dred Scott decision might include:

- President Buchanan's poor handling of the Panic of 1857 led to increasing support for the Republican Party. The Republicans offered higher tariffs to protect Northern businesses and markets, which was voted down by Buchanan and the Democrats
- it was Lincoln himself who was significant in increasing support for the Republican Party. His challenge to Douglas in the 1858 Congressional elections was widely publicised, with Lincoln winning the popular vote
- the split in the Democratic Party at the Charleston Convention (April 1860) and the Baltimore Convention (June 1860) over the issue of a pro-Southern platform effectively made winning the 1860 election impossible for the Democrats, causing more Northern support for the Republicans
- there had been a significant increase in abolitionist sentiment in the years 1857 to 1860, which pushed more voters into the Republican camp. Abolitionists, such as Frederick Douglass, were encouraging Northern voters to vote for the Republicans, especially in 1858 when he encouraged the people of Illinois to vote for Lincoln in the 1858 Congressional elections.

Students may argue that the Dred Scott decision to permit slavery expansion, despite previous Congressional Acts restricting it, caused a significant backlash and a massive surge of support for the Republicans, who clearly campaigned against slavery expansion. The Supreme Court was heavily linked to the 'Slave Power', and whilst the Kansas-Nebraska Act, 1854, was palatable to the North, the Dred Scott decision was considered far worse. Alternatively, other factors for the rise of the Republicans are also significant, especially the rise of Lincoln and the splintering of the Democratic Party by 1860.