

Paper 8697/5 (History of the USA, 1840-1968)

Question Number	Mark Scheme Details	Part Mark
1	(Note: all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essay questions.) Source-based Questions	
L1	Writes about the hypothesis, no use of sources	[1-5]
	These answers will write about the differing attitudes to the Union but will ignore the question, i.e. they will not use sources as information and or evidence to test the stated hypothesis. Included here are answers using information taken from the sources but only to provide a summary of events, rather than for testing the hypothesis.	
L2	Uses information taken from sources to challenge OR support the hypothesis	[6-7]
	These answers use sources as information rather than evidence. Sources are used at face value only with no evaluation or interpretation in context e.g. 'In source A Seward says the US must sooner or later become entirely a slave-holding nation or entirely a free-labor nation; the North wants to break up the Union,' or alternatively in Source E Lincoln says 'The Union of these states is perpetual so the Union cannot be broken up.'	
L3	Uses information taken from sources to challenge AND support the hypothesis	[9-13]
	These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempts to confirm and to deny it. However sources are used still only at face value. For example, Sources A and B say that there is no basis for the continuance of the Union in its present form. However in Source E Lincoln says the Union can continue even if slavery still exists.	
L4	By interpreting and/or evaluating sources in context, find 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 these in their historical context i.e. not accepting them at face value. For example, Seward in Source A is speaking in an election campaign hence is dramatising differences between the Republicans and the Buchanan Administration. In Source E, on the other hand, Lincoln has won his election and is clearly trying to calm down feelings, hence his conciliatory remarks in the earlier parts of his speech.	

- L5 **By interpreting and evaluating sources in context, find evidence to challenge AND support the hypothesis.** [17-21]

These answers know that testing involves attempt to confirm and deny the hypothesis, and are capable of using sources as evidence to do this.

Here the evidence is used in a more balanced way to best support and deny the assertions, giving due weight to the context of the sources.

- 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 preferred.** [22-25]

If one looks at the context of the Sources B-E, taking into account non given evidence from other sources it can be argued that a little give or take on the side of the South could have secured their immediate grievances within the Union. On the other hand, in context it may well be the case that passions had gone too deep for this to be possible.

Essay Questions

- 2 The key to a good answer is a structured analysis giving *reasons* for the expansion. Among the main ones are conquest for national security, the doctrine of Manifest Destiny asking that Providence intended the US to control the entire North American landmass, the lure of good quality land in huge amounts uninhabited except by North American tribes, or Mexicans, neither in a position to resist American immigration. [25]

Most important of all was the war with Mexico, which was forced on Mexico and which resulted in the annexation of Texas, California, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona and Utah, and rounded off America's land borders from coast to coast. Better candidates might note that though 'Manifest Destiny' clearly included Canada, Britain was strong enough to deter US attempts to expand there, also that the consequences of this vast expansion was to stir up sectional strains and the slavery issue.

- 3 Both Lincoln and Davis were born in Kentucky (a slave state), and by 1860 Davis had more political and military experience than Lincoln. However Lincoln grew in stature in office, he was prepared to risk accusations of dictatorship by his emergency measures, and maintained successful control over military commanders. Though his cabinet contained men who aspired to his office (e.g. Seward and Stanton), he was firmly in control. His refusal to compromise either with abolitionists or those seeking concessions to the confederacy, paid off. His Emancipation Proclamation was a masterpiece of timing. In contrast, Davis was too proud, sensitive and eager to quarrel. He neglected political leadership and concentrated exclusively on military matters. His main defect was in being unable to attain any centralised direction of the war and being unable to face down his opponents who obstructed his policies. [25]

- 4 The key concept here is 'linked' progress. In spite of many obstacles a substantial labour movement was in place by 1914, albeit weaker and more divided than in Europe. Better answers will seek to explain, not just discuss. Employers found it very easy to play off different groups against each other. The industrial workforce was largely immigrant, divided by language, ethnic origin and religion. Both they and native born workers refused to associate with blacks. Employers' tactics were much more ruthless than in Europe, even armed force being used. The Bill of Rights was also interpreted by the courts in favour of capital, and the overwhelming majority of small businessmen and farmers regarded trade unionism as un-American. Good answers will also explain the deep gulf between organisations of skilled workers, such as The Knights of Labor, later AFL, and those fighting for all sections of the workforce, also the prevailing absence of any ideological mission, summarised in Gomper's one word definition of labor's aims as 'More!'. As labor unions mirrored the values of their employers and society, they were in effect part of the American system of capitalism. The radical, anarcho-syndicalist elements such as the Wobblies (Industrial Workers of the World) were discredited among law abiding sections of America because of their espousal of violence as a legitimate means of obtaining their ends. [25]
- 5 The start of the period saw the famous Brown judgement of the US Supreme Court. This was seen as a triumph for the tactics of the NAACP (National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People) which had concentrated its effects on test cases in the courts and lobbying Congress. Brown outlawed all forms of racial discrimination in public schools, and by implication all other public amenities. The decision was unanimous. However implementation was another matter and this proved to be very slow with a strong backlash among whites particularly in the South. Accordingly more militant approaches were adopted by Blacks, the main one being Martin Luther King's non violent SCLC (Southern Christian Leadership Conference) which engaged in direct action to desegregate buses, lunch counters, etc. In 1963 a huge March on Washington took place leading, via civil rights marches in the Deep South, to the seminal Civil Rights Act 1964, which enfranchised the Southern blacks for the first time since Reconstruction. However even King's tactics were too moderate for many blacks and a number of high profile and studiously aggressive groups were formed such as The Black Panthers and the Black Muslims. To attain higher bands of marks involves assessing effectiveness and one would expect a discussion following these lines. By itself the NAACP would have made slower progress, it took King's more militant (though non violent) approach to speed things along. The effect of the other black groups was possibly to alienate and frighten non blacks rather than convince them of the need to accommodate black demands. [25]

- 6 The key issue here is to analyse the consequences and effects of the New Deal. Mere description of the New Deal will merit up to 15 marks, if with good material up to 17. [25]

If one takes the whole balance sheet of the New Deal from 1933 to 1938 there are winners and losers. There was little benefit to sharecroppers, small farmers, the rural unemployed, the old. Nor was there any shift of wealth from capital to labour. However the urban population and organised labour in particular gained greatly, so too did many medium and large businesses. FDR appointed a large number of Catholics, Jews, Blacks and women to governmental posts, thus starting a major shift in political power that has continued ever since. By 1938, there were, however, still 10 million unemployed in the USA.

- 7 US mediation in the Russo-Japanese War and the award of the newly constituted Nobel Peace Prize to President T Roosevelt showed the world that the US was now a major power. In this topic it is important that candidates make clear terminal dates and anything up to 1917 at latest should be allowed. What is required is a structured discussion of how this situation occurred. There may be some background material on the spectacular development of the US economy and the flexing of muscles in the Caribbean, East Asia and Central America in the late 19th century but the main focus should be on the build up to, the course of, and consequences of the Spanish-American War of 1898. This too should be set in the context of the New Imperialism and these doctrines may well be sketched in outline, particularly those of Mahan. There should be an assessment of America's role following the war. Candidates who wish to argue against the view should not be penalised as long as their case is presented well, to say that the US was not a world power until 1914, for example. [25]

- 8 The key is to define clearly what is meant by mass media. This includes, of course, the print media and this should be divided into those that reflect existing societal values, such as the vast local and state press, and those that to an extent help to form and refine these, such as the New York Times and the Washington Post. However the influence of the latter was indirect, being obsessively read and digested by political élites, key business figures, and opinion formers. If one defines society broadly, then the Wall Street Journal clearly influenced the economy, and the vast women's magazines have both reflected and changed values on divorce, careers, childcare, abortion. The great triumph of the media, the Post's successful hounding of Nixon in The Watergate Scandal, belongs outside this period though candidates who mention it should not be penalised. [25]

However, the bulk of answers will be concerned with the impact of television and with the more sophisticated responses, the internet. The former has had a vast influence and one should expect some detailed and well analysed responses. It has brought the White House (and Congress) into every home, and has dramatised foreign affairs (e.g. Vietnam, in a way never done before. CNN's coverage is probably the best in the world. The treatment of minorities has been profoundly affected, by the portrayal of women and ethnic groups in leading roles. Better answers will evaluate and analyse not merely describe.