

# UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS

GCE Advanced Subsidiary and Advanced Level

## MARK SCHEME for the November 2004 question paper

### 9697 HISTORY

**9697/05 Paper 5 (The History of the USA, c. 1840-1968),  
maximum raw mark 100**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and students, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were initially instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began. Any substantial changes to the mark scheme that arose from these discussions will be recorded in the published *Report on the Examination*.

All Examiners are instructed that alternative correct answers and unexpected approaches in candidates' scripts must be given marks that fairly reflect the relevant knowledge and skills demonstrated.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the *Report on the Examination*.

- CIE will not enter into discussion or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the November 2004 question papers for most IGCSE and GCE Advanced Level syllabuses.



**Grade thresholds** taken for Syllabus 9697 (History) in the November 2004 examination.

	maximum mark available	minimum mark required for grade:		
		A	B	E
Component 5	100	73	67	44

The thresholds (minimum marks) for Grades C and D are normally set by dividing the mark range between the B and the E thresholds into three. For example, if the difference between the B and the E threshold is 24 marks, the C threshold is set 8 marks below the B threshold and the D threshold is set another 8 marks down. If dividing the interval by three results in a fraction of a mark, then the threshold is normally rounded down.

November 2004

**GCE AS/A LEVEL**

MARK SCHEME

MAXIMUM MARK: 100

SYLLABUS/COMPONENT: 9697/05

HISTORY

Paper 5

The History of the USA, c 1840-1968



Page 1	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	5

Note: all Questions are to be marked using the generic bands for source based and essay questions

## 1. Source-Based Question

### THE ECONOMIC INTERPRETATION OF THE CIVIL WAR

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO USE OF SOURCES [1-5]

These answers will write about the Civil War but they will ignore the question i.e. they will not use the Sources as information/evidence to test the given hypothesis. Included in this level are answers which use information taken from the sources but only in providing a summary of events rather than for testing the hypothesis.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6-8]

These answers use the Sources as information rather than evidence i.e. sources are taken at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context. For example, For the hypothesis; In A Davis states “You want to promote the industry of New England at the expense of the South and in E the US historian states “the Civil War was simply a conflict between the different systems of economic production”. Against the hypothesis; in C Lincoln describes it as a struggle to see if democracy is viable “Can a government of the people maintain itself?” and Stephens in D “a contest between the supporters of a strictly Federal Government and those of a thoroughly National one”.

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [9-13]

These answers know that testing a hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm **AND** disconfirm it. However, sources are still only used at face value. For example, there is evidence both for **AND** against the proposition so that all the Sources cited above in L2 will be used plus Source B.

L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [14-16]

These answers are capable of using sources as evidence, i.e. demonstrating their utility in testing the hypothesis, by interpreting them in their historical context, i.e. not simply accepting them at face value. For example, Yes Davis should know as he was to be the President of the Confederacy; and he is quite emphatic. In Source B, only the conclusion is given, and earlier Seward goes into detail about the economic clashes between the North and South. No, the approach adopted in Source E is very much a minority one among American historians and would be regarded by most as one sided and simplistic.

<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

- L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDING EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [17-21]

These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves attempting both to confirm and disconfirm the hypothesis, and are capable of using Sources as evidence to do this (i.e. both confirmation and disconfirmation are done at this level). For example, as Level 4, except that the different views based on interpreting/evaluating evidence are done in parallel, not as alternatives.

- L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (A) EXPLAIN WHY EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE/SUPPORT IS BETTER/PREFERRED, **OR** (B) RECONCILES/EXPLAINS PROBLEMS IN THE EVIDENCE TO SHOW THAT NEITHER CHALLENGE NOR SUPPORT IS TO BE PREFERRED. [22-25]

For (A) the argument must be that the evidence for challenging or supporting the claim is more justified. This must involve a comparative judgement i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse. For example, Source C in particular, that of the President, would carry much more weight than Source E an individual Marxist historian's view which assumes the validity of economic determinism. Source D would carry some weight and in Source A one could ask what the context of the debate was that Davis was addressing.

For (B) include all Level 5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to contradict/support it) in order to improve it. For example, it is possible to evolve, with the support of the Sources in their context, a modified version of the hypothesis, that economic factors were more important than the traditional viewpoint of slavery and secession while not being the sole or even the most important causative factor in the war.

<b>Page 3</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

## Essay Questions

### 2. Why was it that the 1850 Compromise had started to unravel by 1856?

The 1850 Compromise arose out of the fierce sectional conflict whether slavery should be allowed or banned in territories acquired from Mexico. The Wilmot Proviso, passed twice by the House but rejected by the Senate (where the South had parity with the North) would have banned slavery from these territories. The Compromise gave something to everybody, but on balance the North gained much more than the South with California's admission as a Free State breaking the Southern parity of representation in the Senate. The one concession to the South was a tougher, more easily enforceable Fugitive Slave Law to compel the return of runaway slaves.

Unlike the 1820 Missouri Compromise the 1850 one lasted less than a decade. It failed to address the central issue of the morality of slavery, nor did anything to allay the growing mutual suspicion between the sections. The opening of the Great Plains to settlement made a transcontinental railroad a certainty and as the areas covered were unsuitable for plantation, it seemed certain they would be Free States making the scheme a permanent and demanding minority in the Senate. Douglas' ingenious doctrine of popular sovereignty seemed a way round this but aroused ferocious opposition in the North where anti-slavery feelings had grown greatly over the last few years and the return of fugitive slaves had proved in practice impossible to enforce. The Kansas-Nebraska Act led directly to the formation of a new phenomenon in American politics, an ideological party capable of mass support. This was the Republican Party committed to 'free labor' and opposed to any extension of slavery. By 1856 the sectional divide had therefore become institutionalised with extremely serious consequences for the Union. In the Presidential election the Republican Party candidate did not even bother to campaign in any of the 13 slave states. As by 1856 the North was much more dynamic economically and socially than the South, attracting the vast majority of new immigrants and nearly all new industry and commerce, the 1850 Compromise based implicitly on parity between the Sections became impossible to sustain.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.

<b>Page 4</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

**3 'The victory of the Union in the Civil War was inevitable.' How far do you agree with this view?**

This is the verdict of hindsight and most responses will focus on the Union's overwhelming predominance in manufacturing, industry and commerce, the larger and more co-ordinated railroad network and the much greater population (particularly when the slaves were excluded from the Southern count). In addition, there was the much larger merchant marine and, not least, the far superior financial resources and banking system of the Union. However, this was not how it appeared at the time. European opinion was that the Confederacy would win its bid for independence. It merely had to wage a defensive war; it did not have to take the initiative but merely to withstand attacks. Its population knew the lie of the land, and were fighting for their homes. The South had internal communications and could (and did) make life very difficult for the Union forces. Moreover, it was doubted whether the population of the North had the tenacity and commitment to fight a long war merely to force the Southern population into continuing in a Union they wished to leave. In the event the South could have won, victory being defined as preventing the Union from conquering (and holding) a large hostile territory. In the early stages of the conflict the South had the superior generals. On two occasions the South came close to achieving its aim. First, at Gettysburg where a Southern victory on Northern soil could well have broken Northern commitment to war; secondly, in mid 1864, when the Confederacy's seeming invincibility produced acute war weariness in the North, and the distinct possibility of a Democratic victory, with an armistice followed by peace negotiations.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

**4. Evaluate the effectiveness of Progressivism on the United States politically, socially and economically from 1901 to 1916.**

Progressivism was a label loosely applied to men and women of good will who believed that through greater democracy and openness it was possible to clean up American politics, particularly at the local level, by exposing the wrong doing of corrupt city bosses, ruthless monopolies and unspecified special interests. It was assumed that once this was done the evils would be rectified. It was not a revolutionary or even a radical movement; its emphasis was on efficiency, moderate social reform, and a preoccupation with the mechanics of government such as the primary, referendum, recall, elected mayors and Senators. It was also selective, being suspicious of trade unions and uninterested in Afro-Americans. Essentially it was a middle class movement of a reforming earnest group who believed that all would be well if people like themselves were running things. It must be remembered that in the period in question Socialism was growing rapidly among working class voters, particularly immigrants and Progressivism provided a softer easier alternative reform programme

Effectiveness was probably greater in the field of social work, housing, slum clearance and public health. There was a great deal of talk about trust-breaking but with little actually done. The much vaunted political reforms such as primaries did not make any significant change to the type of people elected or ensure reform. There was the naive belief that all problems were soluble and that identifying a problem would be enough to ensure a solution to it. There was little interest in the dynamics or mechanics of economic growth and development or how much equality was attainable or indeed desirable. Its achievements in the field of conservation were considerable.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.



<b>Page 6</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

**5. Account for the dramatic rise and fall of the revived Ku Klux Klan in the 1920s.**

The revived Klan is best seen as part of the defensive response of old-stock Americans that the country was being undermined by subversive and foreign influences. Other examples were immigration restriction, religious fundamentalism and prohibition. There was also a sharp reaction against the progressivism, 'do goodism' and internationalism of the Wilson era.

Though the founder of the new Klan had been influenced by a Southerner watching the film 'Birth of a Nation' which glorified the earlier Klan, after the Civil War the new Klan was nationalist rather than sectional and had much wider objectives; mostly negative, such as hostility to Jews, Catholics, foreigners and Un-American influences. At times these even rivalled hostility to Black Americans though the Klan was responsible for extreme brutality here. By using professional fundraisers and elaborate ceremonies and rituals, the Klan spread spectacularly and at its peak had over 2 million members and controlled politics in a number of Western and South Western states. Its main appeal was to groups of declining status who felt under threat.

There was a very strong backlash against the Klan and members were regularly attacked and dismissed from public employment. In Boston, Klan meetings were banned even in private homes.

Its decline may be ascribed to three reasons

- 1) Having no positive programme, emotional fervour could not be sustained.
- 2) Vocal and violent opposition made Klan membership a danger rather than a benefit in seeking employment or business.
- 3) A number of serious sexual and corruption scandals received maximum adverse publicity.

Better responses may regard the revived KKK as the last in a series of short lived nativist, anti-immigrant movements such as the Know-Nothings, or the Anti-Mason Party.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004	9697	5

## 6. Why was opposition to the New Deal so fierce?

It needs to be noted that the New Deal was a catchphrase embracing a period of four to five years and a number of different programmes and policies rather than a coherent strategy. In so far as there were common themes, it was that FDR was clearly an activist *par excellence* and he believed it was the task of the Federal Government to provide solutions to the obvious problems of the slump, and secondly that he was an improviser and pragmatist, willing to experiment with any ideas (however unorthodox and unconventional), and to discard them if they did not appear to work.

Opposition came at different groups at different times. Once it is clear that the economic crisis had moderated, conservatives objected strongly to the New Deal's interventionism in the economy and social experiments, also the huge cost of relief programmes and vast budget deficits. Among their ranks in the Liberty League were the previous Democratic candidates Al Smith and John Davis.

A second line of attack was radical, that the New Deal did not go far enough to transfer wealth and income to the less well off. Millions flocked to a variety of demagogues such as Father Coughlin and crackpot remedies such as Dr Townsend's federal pension of \$200 a month for over 60s. Later in 1937 the controversy over FDR's rather devious plan to 'stack' the Supreme Court formed a protest for Southern Democrats to desert the President and join forces with Republicans within an anti-New Deal coalition.

It needs to be pointed out that, although opposition was widespread and the press was overwhelmingly anti-him, FDR was re-elected in 1936 with the largest ever popular mandate and both House and Senate went strongly to the Democrats. However, by 1938 FDR's popularity had sapped and his attempts to punish his Congressional critics in the mid-term elections failed miserably. The most intense opposition probably came from the very rich (at most 5% of the population), unaffected by the Slump, who regarded FDR as a traitor to his class and who feared that the New Deal might take a more radical turn, which was always a possibility. Accusations of FDR's dictatorial tendencies became more strident after 1936 with his ruthless proposals to stack the court and his seeming bypassing of normal Constitutional constraints.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

**7. To what extent were FDR's policies towards the 'aggressor states' between 1933 and 1941 weak and ineffective?**

By aggressor states, it is meant Japan, Germany and Italy. FDR, more so than other democratic leaders was constrained by public opinion and a relatively independent bi-cameral legislature. Though it was clear that all three states had aggressive designs and in the case of Japan had already invaded Manchuria, FDR pursued a policy of moderate isolationism. Unfortunately anti-war sentiment grew in the US as from 1935 onwards it became clear that a new global conflict was a likely outcome. The series of Neutrality Acts passed by Congress tied his hands, and only in 1937 did he start to give prime attention to foreign affairs. His 'quarantine' speech in October 1937 provoked a hostile reaction and the US would not go beyond moral condemnation of Japan and Italy. It can be argued that from 1933 to the fall of France in 1940 FDR's policies were hesitant, inheroic and never went beyond rhetoric to concrete and specific measures to deter aggressor states. It was the thinking in London and Paris that the USA could not be relied on to help with actions rather than words. However, once it became clear that only Great Britain stood between Germany and Italy's dominance of the whole Atlantic seaboard, and the Mediterranean then FDR's policy became one of all out help to Britain short of war. Answers should deal with such measures as the transfer of 'surplus' planes and guns to replace those lost at Dunkirk, and later 50 World War I destroyers in exchange for 99-year leases in the West Indies. Even these measures proved inadequate and after re election for a third term in 1940, FDR introduced Lend-Lease by which the US became in effect the arsenal for the British war effort, then on the very edge of bankruptcy. Due to German U Boat dominance in the Atlantic FDR, by a series of steps, had by late 1941 become involved in an undeclared naval war with Germany though he hesitated from full belligerency. In the event Germany and Italy declared war on the United States following Pearl Harbour. The quotation would appear to be accurate up to 1940, but the events of that year transformed FDR's policy to one of increasing aid, by all means short of war, to Britain.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.

<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>A/AS LEVEL – NOVEMBER 2004</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>5</b>

**8. How far is it true to say that there was an ‘urban crisis’ in America in 1968?**

By 1968 there were acute physical, financial and social problems in America’s cities and candidates should go into some detail here. Such factors as decay, pollution, flight by the middle classes, record crime levels, near bankruptcy could all be mentioned. The following causes could be discussed.

First, migration into cities of groups already suffering from poverty, high unemployment, low education, and poor housing all placed a huge burden on urban public facilities and services. Secondly the flight of middle class whites and industry reduced tax revenues and left abandoned and decaying factories and buildings. Thirdly, the fragmentation and complexity of local government hindered cooperation. Fourthly, housing policy although well meaning was ineffective and made matters worse, with new slums being created. Fifthly, a rising crime rate due to many factors. Measures to deal with the crisis fall largely outside the period except to Johnson’s well meaning but ineffective War on Poverty.

High quality answers will be consistently analytical, well argued and with high quality supporting material relevantly deployed and will score 21-25.

Good answers (18-20) will be mostly analytical/explanatory but with some unevenness in structure of argument and the quality of supporting material.

Bare pass answers (11-15) will be largely descriptive or narrative and relevance and accuracy may stray.