

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2010 question paper
for the guidance of teachers

9697 HISTORY

9697/53

Paper 53, maximum raw mark 100

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes must be read in conjunction with the question papers and the report on the examination.

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

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2010 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.

Page 2	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

GENERIC MARK BANDS FOR ESSAY QUESTIONS

Examiners will assess which Level of Response best reflects most of the answer. An answer will not be required to demonstrate all of the descriptions in a particular Level to qualify for a Mark Band.

In bands of 3 marks, examiners will normally award the middle mark, moderating it up or down according to the particular qualities of the answer. In bands of 2 marks, examiners should award the lower mark if an answer just deserves the band and the higher mark if the answer clearly deserves the band.

Band	Marks	Levels of Response
1	21–25	The approach will be consistently analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. Essays will be fully relevant. The argument will be structured coherently and supported by very appropriate factual material and ideas. The writing will be accurate. At the lower end of the band, there may be some weaker sections but the overall quality will show that the candidate is in control of the argument. The best answers must be awarded 25 marks.
2	18–20	Essays will be focused clearly on the demands of the question but there will be some unevenness. The approach will be mostly analytical or explanatory rather than descriptive or narrative. The answer will be mostly relevant. Most of the argument will be structured coherently and supported by largely accurate factual material. The impression will be that a good solid answer has been provided.
3	16–17	Essays will reflect a clear understanding of the question and a fair attempt to provide an argument and factual knowledge to answer it. The approach will contain analysis or explanation but there may be some heavily descriptive or narrative passages. The answer will be largely relevant. Essays will achieve a genuine argument but may lack balance and depth in factual knowledge. Most of the answer will be structured satisfactorily but some parts may lack full coherence.
4	14–15	Essays will indicate attempts to argue relevantly although often implicitly. The approach will depend more on some heavily descriptive or narrative passages than on analysis or explanation, which may be limited to introductions and conclusions. Factual material, sometimes very full, will be used to impart information or describe events rather than to address directly the requirements of the question. The structure of the argument could be organised more effectively.
5	11–13	Essays will offer some appropriate elements but there will be little attempt generally to link factual material to the requirements of the question. The approach will lack analysis and the quality of the description or narrative, although sufficiently accurate and relevant to the topic if not the particular question, will not be linked effectively to the argument. The structure will show weaknesses and the treatment of topics within the answer will be unbalanced.
6	8–10	Essays will not be properly focused on the requirements of the question. There may be many unsupported assertions and commentaries that lack sufficient factual support. The argument may be of limited relevance to the topic and there may be confusion about the implications of the question.
7	0–7	Essays will be characterised by significant irrelevance or arguments that do not begin to make significant points. The answers may be largely fragmentary and incoherent. Marks at the bottom of this Band will be given very rarely because even the most wayward and fragmentary answers usually make at least a few valid points.

Page 3	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

SECTION A: THE CAUSES OF THE CIVIL WAR

- 1 Source-based question: 'Slavery was somehow the cause of the war.' Using Sources A–E discuss how far the evidence supports Lincoln's assertion.
NB To attain the higher levels (4–6) candidates must evaluate sources in their historical context.**

L1 WRITES ABOUT THE HYPOTHESIS, NO VALID USE OF SOURCES [1–5]
These answers will write about the hypothesis but will not use the sources as evidence. Candidates may produce an essay type response with no reference to the sources.

L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE OR SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [6–8]
These answers use the sources as information rather than as evidence, i.e. sources are used at face value only with no evaluation/interpretation in context.
Against the hypothesis: *Source C says that Lincoln was prepared to keep slavery if this preserved the union which is his sole aim.*
For the hypothesis: *Source A states clearly that the threat to the existence of slavery was the cause of South Carolina's secession.*

L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM SOURCES TO CHALLENGE AND SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS [9–13]
These answers know that testing the hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and to disprove it. However, sources are still used only at face value.
For example both sets of points (or similar ones) used in Level 2 responses above could be used so as to put the case for AND against the hypothesis. However the sources are still used at face value.

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 their face value.
For the hypothesis: *Source A is a strong piece of evidence as it was for a unanimous vote of the state legislature, popularly elected, but did they realise that Lincoln would use force to stamp out secession?*
Against the hypothesis: *Davis' statement appears to refute the hypothesis, but was written several years after the event to justify his own activities. Politicians' memories are notoriously selective and unreliable in facing uncomfortable facts.*

L5 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS 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 points made for Level 4 answers, and/or similar relevant ones can be used here. It is essential that BOTH alternative views are put forward and that these are based on interpreting/evaluating the evidence.

Page 4	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

L6 AS L5, PLUS **EITHER** (a) EXPLAINS 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 agreeing/disagreeing is better/preferred. This must involve a comparative judgement, i.e. not just why some evidence is better, but also why other evidence is worse.

For (b) include all L5 answers which use the evidence to **modify** the hypothesis (rather than simply seeking to support/contradict) in order to improve it.

For example the hypothesis can be altered in a number of ways using evidence in context; *slavery was the main cause of the war, or that secession, not slavery was the main cause of the war.*

Page 5	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

Section B – Essay Questions: indicative marking scheme

2 Analyse the causes and consequences of the annexation of Texas by the United States.

Responses may be weighted towards the consequences of annexation but it is necessary to analyse, not merely state or describe, both elements of the question. The consequences are fairly straightforward, though skill will be needed in handling the narrative. First, there was the victorious war with Mexico in 1846 provoked by President Polk over the dubious claim that the Rio Grande constituted the border of Texas. Victory led to vast territories being annexed and the whole issue of slavery in the Territories being re-opened. The causes of annexation were more complex. A starting point would be Mexico's independence in 1822 when Texas was simply a remote, under populated province of the new nation. Originally, Americans were invited to settle and given land grants on strict conditions. In 1829 Mexico abolished slavery which however still continued in practice with the American settlers. In 1830 Mexico banned further American settlement and there followed a series of disputes culminating in the declaration of an independent Texan republic in 1836. The Mexican army led by the President Santa Anna attempted to suppress this and at the famous siege of the Alamo the entire garrison was killed. However, the Texans defeated the Mexicans decisively at the battle of San Jacinto and Santa Anna was taken prisoner and, under duress, recognised Texan independence. The new Republic applied for admission to the Union but Presidents Jackson and Van Buren shelved the issue for internal political reasons. There was strong opposition to annexation in the North as it was feared that Texas was so large that it could be carved up into as many as five slave states, thus strengthening the institution of slavery and Southern political influence. The independent Texan Republic was recognised by France and Britain and the latter negotiated commercial treaties and courted the new State. This caused alarm in Washington and President Tyler authorised annexation negotiations. These were mishandled by the Secretary of State Calhoun and the treaty was rejected by the Senate. In 1844 the first 'dark horse' candidate for the Presidency, James K Polk made the Texas and Oregon questions the central part of his election platform in highly aggressive terms. Annexation of Texas was still opposed by anti-slavery Congressmen and also there were strong objections to its being put forward by a joint resolution of both Houses which only required a simple majority, much easier than the two thirds needed in the Senate. In fact the resolutions were passed narrowly in early 1845. Among prominent opponents was former President John Quincy Adams who described it as the 'direst calamity'. Mexico immediately broke off diplomatic relations with the United States. Texas was admitted to the Union in December 1845 as a single state. Given Polk's highly aggressive language, referring to the 're-annexation of Texas' implying that it had always belonged to the United States, it was clear that he had war with Mexico in contemplation unless the latter was prepared to back down.

Page 6	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

3 'From the outset it was quite clear that the Union would ultimately be victorious in the Civil War'. To what extent do you agree with this assessment?

Opinion in Europe was that the Confederacy would be able to maintain its independence by waging a defensive war, preventing the Union forces from being able to conquer and occupy its territory when the population was supportive of local rulers and the Confederacy had internal lines of communication. However, the North had a far larger population and did not have the problem of policing slaves, its industrial strength was far greater, in particular in armament production where there was only one Southern steel foundry in Richmond, Virginia. It was the financial centre of the nation and the North had a more highly developed railway system. Its maritime marine was far larger. The South believed that because America relied on cotton exports that were all produced in the South, this would cause European recognition, but the effective Union blockade prevented the export of cotton and at no stage did public opinion in Britain urge the government to support the Confederacy. The leading Generals in the war had all fought in the Mexican War and Robert E Lee and Stonewall Jackson proved superior to their Union counterparts in the early stages. Better candidates will point out that support for secession was by no means overwhelming. The decision to secede was taken by State conventions which in Georgia and Virginia were only narrowly successful. The opponents of secession mustered 25 per cent of the votes in these conventions. It has been noted that 697 wealthy men took the decision to secede on behalf of 9 million, mostly poor men and women, of whom 3 million were slaves. 'Ultimately victorious' needs to be addressed. Largely because of the above factors the longer the war went on the more probable a Union victory was. The fact that the war went on for more than four years was largely due to the skill of Lee in waging a defensive strategy leading to acute war weariness in 1864. At the outset Lincoln was underrated; he appeared to be an inexperienced provincial politician who would be dominated by his Cabinet. It is of course a matter of record that he grew in office and is regarded as one of the greatest of all Presidents.

4 Is it correct to say that there was an 'agrarian revolt' in the 1870s and 1880s?

It needs to be stated that the term 'revolt' is hyperbole; at no point was there rioting, illegal occupations or refusal to pay taxes on a large scale. Nevertheless it was clear that working farmers were very angry and a determined effort was made to break the two party system with a specifically farmers' party. However, the US was becoming increasingly urbanised with the majority of the population living in towns and cities from 1881 onwards, so that the chances of redress of grievances was limited, particularly as many of their problems were beyond the control of government. The basic problem was an international crisis of over-production with virgin lands in Australia, Canada, Argentina and Russia which inevitably led to dramatically falling prices. There were other local reasons for complaint. Railroads, essential for transporting produce, charged extortionate rates to farmers, who were effectively subsidising the big Trusts. Interest rates to farmers were very high, often in the range of 15 to 25 percent and banks were ruthless in foreclosing on farmers who fell into arrears. Nearly everything farmers bought came from large manufacturing concerns who overcharged farmers. Finally they claimed that as consumers they were paying the bill for the protective tariff which assisted American manufacturers by keeping out cheaper foreign imports. Their remedy was political action through first, the Granger movement, very active from 1868 to 1884 and later on the Peoples' Party, usually known as Populists. The latter was successful at State levels and eventually converted the Democratic Party to campaign on a largely Populist programme. However, little was achieved and 'free silver' was largely an irrelevance, but regarded with horror by respectable financial institutions. Federal administrations, under the control of conservative Republicans or the equally conservative Grover Cleveland, did little or nothing to alleviate farmers' concerns.

Page 7	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

5 'The role of Malcolm X in securing African American civil rights has been consistently underestimated. 'How far do you agree with this judgement?'

There have always been two distinct strands within the African-American movement for civil rights. The first, started by Booker T Washington, stressed moderation, gradual advancement and not alienating mainstream white opinion; the second, which may be very loosely called 'Black Power', symbolised by W E B Du Bois, stressed self-reliance by African-Americans, much greater militancy and assertiveness and ignoring white liberals. Martin Luther King was the best example of the former, although he advocated non violent civil disobedience. Malcolm Little (usually known as Malcolm X) chose the second path. Like King he was a charismatic personality and also a spell binding orator. His background however was quite different; a child from the ghettos, a jailbird with little formal education, in a sharp contrast to King's middle class upbringing. Malcolm X chose to follow Islam precisely because it was not a white man's religion. Both he and King were assassinated and it appears that they had no contact with each other. Malcolm X's influence was very strong among young urban blacks where King was weak. He had no interest in cultivating or lobbying white, liberal politicians whom he treated with contempt. It is fair to say that he was regarded with horror by mainstream white opinion. However, in a sense he did have an important role that has been underplayed. Precisely because he had great influence among young urban blacks and also because, while never specifically advocating violence, he frequently mocked King's doctrine of non violence, he showed white liberals and moderate white opinion how urgent and important it was to back the more moderate and reasonable King who always operated within the parameters of the political system. The message was quite clear, if King's strategy was to be rejected and his policies fail, then Malcolm X, or other black 'extremists', would almost certainly gain much greater influence over the African-American population with disturbing consequences. It therefore can be argued that Malcolm X contributed indirectly to the passing of the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act and the Poll Tax Amendment to the Constitution.

6 Why was Roosevelt's victory in the 1940 Presidential election much more narrow than in 1932 and 1936?

The obvious point that the most able candidates will make was that it would have been almost impossible for FDR to replicate his annihilating defeats of Hoover and Landon in 1932 and 1936 respectively. In the latter year the Republican candidate had only won Maine and Vermont. However, victory in 1940 was by no means certain for FDR. First, there was the widespread feeling that a third Presidential term was, if not unconstitutional, unprecedented and undesirable. As Roosevelt was frequently accused of dictatorial tendencies this point had some force. His second term of office had been disappointing with a number of problems; the Supreme Court controversy showed FDR at his worst and he was forced to back down; there was a return of depression in 1937 to 1938 so that in 1940 17 percent of the work force was still unemployed. In spite of large Democratic majorities in both Houses, FDR's relations with Congress were poor and his legislative attainments weak. The US population was overwhelmingly against participation in the Second World War, but there was a widespread suspicion that FDR intended to do just that in spite of the Neutrality Acts. In June 1940 he had transferred surplus US military equipment to Britain and in September 1940 leased to Britain 50 World War I destroyers. The Republicans produced a more electable candidate in Wendell Wilkie, a fresh face in American politics, with an engaging personality and no links to traditional Republicans. He had even voted for Roosevelt in 1932 and had supported the early stages of the New Deal. At one time it appeared that Wilkie might succeed, particularly as for a time FDR's intentions were unclear. However, FDR's greater electioneering skills carried the day combined with the feeling that it would be dangerous to have a novice in the White House when the international situation was so fraught with danger. Roosevelt's victory was comfortable, rather than overwhelming with 27.2 million votes and 38 states to Wilkie's 22.3 million votes and 10 states.

Page 8	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

7 Assess the United States' contribution to Allied victory in World War II.

It could be argued that a major part of the American contribution to ultimate victory was to help Britain from having to negotiate for peace following the fall of France in 1940. This was done in a number of ways; in 1939 a new Neutrality Act had repealed the arms embargo and allowed belligerents to buy arms on a cash and carry basis. The nightmare scenario for America was Germany and her allies having control of not only the entire Eastern Atlantic seaboard, the Mediterranean and the North African shore, but if they acquired the British and French fleets they would possess overwhelming naval superiority over the United States. Hence in June 1940 the President transferred large quantity of American military material to the British. In September 1940, by an executive agreement bypassing Congress, 50 World War I destroyers were handed over to Britain. In January 1941 the Lend Lease Bill gave the President almost a free hand to wage 'undeclared war.' In April and June America occupied Greenland and Iceland and in September 1941 American vessels were convoyed as far as Iceland. These measures have been described as an undeclared naval war which would have justified Germany in taking counter measures and were of invaluable assistance in helping Britain combat the U Boat menace in the Atlantic. Following Pearl Harbour, Hitler made his astonishing declaration of war on the United States, thus ensuring an allied victory in the longer term. The US became the 'arsenal of democracy' and, apart from 15 million well armed and trained troops, produced no less than 300,000 aircraft, 75 per cent of them military. US assistance of essential war materials and supplies to allies was of great importance, particularly to Russia, though this was never publicly acknowledged. America's foreign policy initiatives were also decisive. In 1942 the US entered into its first military commitment to foreign powers since 1778, when FDR, Churchill, Litvinov and the representatives of twenty three other nations at war with the Axis, signed a declaration of the United Nations and (important for Russia) promised not to make a separate peace. Better candidates will avoid the simplistic notion that America won the war singlehanded and will draw attention to the immense Russian contribution to victory with 20 million deaths (military and civilian). Candidates may quote the aphorism 'Britain provided the time, Russia the blood and America the money' as having an element of truth. What is essential is to provide an assessment, rather than assertions not backed by evidence. Some may comment that America was having to fight a war on two quite separate fronts, in Europe and in the Pacific, with priority however being given to the European conflict. America's use of two atomic bombs brought Japan to capitulate without the necessity of invasion.

Page 9	Mark Scheme: Teachers' version	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE AS/A LEVEL – May/June 2010	9697	53

8 How important was the role of religion in post-war American society, 1945–1968?

Though the United States was the first country in the world to separate church and state, religion, particularly Christianity, has played a crucial part in US culture. In the 1950s church membership soared, unprecedented sums were spent on church buildings and religious leaders such as Cardinal Spellman grew in public esteem and influence. At the popular level the marriage of television with religion produced household names, such as the Catholic, Bishop Fulton Sheen and the Protestant, Norman Vincent Peale, with audiences measured in tens of millions. Billy Graham was simply the best known and latest in a long tradition of American evangelists whose highly organised 'crusades' attracted vast audiences and were exported world wide. Religion permeated every level of American life so that membership of a church or synagogue became obligatory for every holder of public office. In Hollywood, movies such as the 'Ten Commandments' and 'Ben Hur' were box office hits. However, it can be queried how much genuine religious feeling actually existed. Much of it was superficial and highly materialistic with the emphasis being on buildings and financial targets. It has been argued that much of this appeal lay in conferring Divine sanction on the American way of life. Home grown American religions such as the Latter Day Saints (Mormons), Christian Science and the Seventh Day Adventists all flourished and adherents of the first two attained high public office. The Roman Catholic church grew spectacularly in both numbers and influence and in 1960 the first Catholic President, John F Kennedy, was elected. Within the Protestant churches there was a pronounced shift away from the well established denominations such as the Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Church to Fundamentalist and or Evangelical groupings, such as the Southern Baptists. African-Americans were overwhelmingly Protestant Christians with their own distinctive brand of worship. The role of the large Jewish community should be mentioned. These were highly influential in persuading President Truman to back the creation of the state of Israel and subsequently to make support for Israel a bi-partisan fixture in US foreign policy.