

## MARK SCHEME for the October/November 2008 question paper

### 9697 HISTORY

9697/05

Paper 5, 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.

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 discussions or correspondence in connection with these mark schemes.

CIE is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2008 question papers for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level syllabuses and some Ordinary Level syllabuses.



<b>Page 2</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

### 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.

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	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008	9697	05

**Note:** all papers are to be marked using the generic marking bands for source-based and essay questions.

### Section A: The Road to Secession and Civil War

- 1** 'The Dred Scott decision demonstrated the Supreme Court's inability to deal with sectional issues in a satisfactory manner.' Using Sources A–E, discuss how far the evidence supports this assertion.

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS-REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
A	Majority judgement (7 out of 9) of Supreme Court given by Chief Justice Roger Taney (from Maryland, a slave state).	N. Strong defence of right of slavery to legally exist in all US territories. Y. Court divided with 9 separate opinions, also a minority dissenting judgement.	Y. Extreme statements certain to polarize and divide public opinion particularly in the North. Y. Court upholds Calhoun's theory on slavery in Territories (Congress has no power to restrict it). N. Function of court is to interpret Constitution and its judgements should be regarded as conclusive.	Y. Sources D & E highly critical of Source A, N. Strong support for Source A by Source B. N. Source C supports Source A 'in the abstract.'	Y. Background to judgement dubious, with President- elect Buchanan intriguing with judges to bolster his own position. Once this was known it weakened respect for the judgement and the standing of the Supreme Court. Y. Five of nine judges (including Taney), came from slave states hence impartiality highly questionable.
B	Defence of Supreme Court judgement in newspaper editorial.	N. Says that Court's judgement should be respected as it is 'highest judicial authority and its reasons are final.'	Y. Needs to be treated with caution. Simply expresses views of its editor and proprietor	Only contemporary reaction to Source A; Source C several months later, D & E hundred years later.	N. The Plain Dealer is a Democrat supporting newspaper in a key Midwestern state (Ohio, a free state), an area of vital importance to both North and South; shows broad support for Source A. Y. Too close to judgement to give balanced opinion. Did it represent the

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008	9697	05

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS- REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
					views of its readers in Cincinnati?
C	Speech of Senator Douglas of Illinois attacking Lincoln, giving qualified support to Supreme Court judgement.	N. Draws distinction between support for Court's decision in 'abstract' and the political realities of administering it. This would require police regulations drafted by local legislature, which are elected by the people.	N. An updating of Douglas' theory of 'Popular Sovereignty' first put forward in Kansas-Nebraska Act. He hoped this would reconcile Court's decision with all sections. Y. Far too devious, trying to have it both ways and simply incurring suspicion from both sections.	N. Text of Taney's judgement in Source A not really capable of supporting Douglas' interpretation. Y. Source E points out that Douglas' doctrine of local choice undermined by Source A.	N. Douglas highly ambitious and wanted to be President, also wanted terminal of trans-continental railroad to be in Chicago (his home state). Therefore wants question of slavery expansion to be settled once and for all, and has to retain support from both North and South; believes this ingenious 'defence' of the Court will do this. However, he has seriously misjudged the reaction.
D	US Historian's critical account of Dred Scott decision.	Y. Highly condemnatory account of background to Court's decision and the strong reaction to it.	N. Does not consider point whether <u>any</u> decision of Court on such a contentious issue could have been 'satisfactory'. Y. A secondary source but reliable as author is a distinguished US historian. Distance lends objectivity but of course author <u>knows</u> what the consequences actually were.	None, relies on other sources of information.	Y. Author in position to have access to all materials, has no axe to grind, but could be influenced by the fact that he knows judgement had such disastrous impact, while Sources (A–C) did not have this knowledge.

<b>Page 5</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

	CONTENT	ANALYSIS [L2–3]	EVALUATION [L4–5]	CROSS- REFERENCE TO OTHER PASSAGES	OTHER (e.g. Contextual knowledge)
E	Critical account of Dred Scott decision.	Y. Argues that decision made division much worse-‘South elated, Northern anger intense’, hence decision ‘unsatisfactory’. Y. Court enters political arena, cut ground from under the Republicans.	Balanced account but does not consider whether it is possible or desirable for a court of law to rule on explosive, political matters where opinion is sharply divided.	Very similar to Source D, but British Historian, not US. Y. Points out that Source C is undermined by the decision.	Y. Author in position to have access to all materials, has no axe to grind, but could be influenced by the fact that he knows judgement had such disastrous impact, while Sources (A–C) did not have this knowledge.

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008	9697	05

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

These answers will write about the decision, but will not use the Sources as evidence.

- L2 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [6–9]

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.

*For example, AGAINST: Source B argues that Supreme Court decisions are ‘final’ and are ‘the supreme law of the land’. FOR: Source E states ‘the decision provoked a greater storm than any other judicial decision before or since’.*

- L3 USES INFORMATION TAKEN FROM THE SOURCES TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [10–14]

These answers know that testing a hypothesis involves both attempting to confirm and disconfirm it. However, sources are used only at face value.

*For example, both sets of points (or similar ones) used in L2 responses above could be used so as to put the case for and against the hypothesis. However, the Sources are still used as face value.*

- L4 BY INTERPRETING/EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **OR** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [15–17]

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, FOR: the decision was arrived at by dubious political machinations of President-elect Buchanan designed to conciliate the Southern sectional interest irrespective of the consequences. Source E gives support to this view and Source A notes that the Chief Justice was from a slave State and clearly had very hard line views on the slavery issue. Four other judges were from slave States. AGAINST: Senator Douglas’s argument in Source C, that the Court was above sectional considerations. Answers need to give some context here e.g. showing Douglas was a highly respected figure who has saved the Union in 1850; why would he want to jeopardise it in 1856?*

- L5 BY INTERPRETING AND EVALUATING SOURCES IN CONTEXT, FINDS EVIDENCE TO CHALLENGE **AND** SUPPORT THE HYPOTHESIS. [18–22]

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, the points made for Level 4 answers, or similar relevant ones. It is essential that both alternative views are put and that these are based on interpreting/evaluating the evidence.

<b>Page 7</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

- 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.

[23–25]

For (A) there must be a comparative judgement, e.g. *Source C is stronger evidence of political opinion than Source B.*

For (B), include all L5 answers which use the evidence to modify the hypothesis, e.g. *the Sources could be used to argue that the courts of law are not appropriate bodies to decide on politically contentious issues, or if they do so, their opinions will always be highly divisive rather than accepted.* Or candidates could challenge what is meant by ‘a satisfactory manner’. Could any decision have satisfied both North and South?

<b>Page 8</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

## Section B

### 2 Why did the Kansas-Nebraska Act (1854) produce such a storm of political controversy?

The 1850 Compromise had ensured an uneasy 'armistice' between the North and South, but the South's big gain, a tougher Fugitive Slave Legislation, was proving very difficult to enforce as abolitionism grew in the North (though still a minority). The Act, by repealing the Missouri Compromise, opened up the possibility of new territories to slavery. The immediate impact was two rival governments in Kansas, and near Civil War there; also, the disappearance of the Know Nothing Party into the formation of the Republican Party, and the Democrats ceasing to be a national party, but a Southern one. Douglas' doctrine of popular sovereignty simply did not work in practice the first time it had been tried. When the dust had settled both Kansas and Nebraska were Free States which had, of course, the effect of ensuring a permanent majority in the US Senate opposed to slavery expansion. Several leading Democrats, such as Seward, were incandescent with rage at what they saw to be Senator Douglas' duplicity. It was following the Kansas-Nebraska Act that the notion of a slave conspiracy took root among serious political commentators. Abolitionist sentiment grew greatly; though divided among themselves, they were a fanatical minority who had influence far beyond their numbers, making it almost impossible to enforce the provisions of the Fugitive Slave Act.

11–13: these answers will have little or no analysis, but some appropriate elements.

18–20: these answers will be mostly analytical/explanatory and supported by accurate material.

21–25: these answers will be consistently analytical and in control of argument.

### 3 'He was hopelessly unfitted for the office of President.' To what extent is this a fair judgement of Grant's two Presidential terms (1869–1877)?

Following the tragic death of Lincoln, Grant was the only truly national hero in America, and was the third man to be elected President because of military exploits. The problem was he had no interest in or knowledge of politics, and seemed to regard the office as a kind of constitutional monarch, to reign while Congress ruled. His choice of Cabinet was poor, hence there were a number of serious scandals, which came close to him, e.g. his private secretary. This did not prevent his being re-elected in 1873 by a large majority. His second term was racked with scandal. A case can be made for Grant. Outside the South he was a less divisive figure than his two predecessors, he stamped down on the Ku Klux Klan and he made some efforts to protect the freedmen in the South. British-American disputes arising out of the Civil War were settled by arbitration. Throughout the appalling scandals, Grant remained curiously detached and above it all. He seemed to have no financial sense and is the only American President who left office financially ruined, ironically through trusting corrupt managers of his investments.

Descriptive accounts can only obtain 15 marks at most; beyond that – analysis/explanation, relevance are essential, the marks depending on the quality of analysis and the quality of supporting evidence. Bare pass answers, 11–15, will be descriptive with little analysis or explanation, good answers, 18–20, will be mostly analytical with good quality supporting evidence, while high quality answers, 21–25, will be consistently analytical and in full control of the argument.



<b>Page 9</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

**4 Why did it prove so difficult for both federal and State governments to regulate big business effectively in the period 1865-1913?**

The key element here is to give reasons, not just discuss events. Answers will require great skill in covering such a long period which saw the US transformed from an agrarian society to being the largest industrial economy in the world; all this accomplished by massive immigration from Europe, which apart from transforming the face of America, provided limitless cheap and highly motivated labour.

The constitution had not been devised to contemplate economic regulation; so that when there was a long sustained boom following the Civil War which saw the rise of giant, near-monopoly cartels, called Trusts, such as the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey, there was no legal framework of legislation in place. This was also the period when Darwinian notions of the survival of the fittest and the merits of unrestrained business activities were dominant. Both parties were opposed to regulation, and were pro-business, while the Supreme Court was consistently opposed to regulation and the Federal involvement in economic activity, even on income tax.

When attempts were made to regulate the railroads by the Interstate Commerce Commission, they proved ineffective, or even became spokesmen for the industry. Many Senators and Congressmen were on the payroll of big business, while this was until 1901 the era of weak Presidents and Congressional government. Better answers will note the change in the twentieth century, with popular demand for business legislation growing rapidly. It could be argued that the progressive activities of Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson to confront the Trusts were little more than attempts to prevent the masses from turning to Socialism (in 1912 Debs obtained 6% of the Presidential vote). Bare pass answers, 11–15, will be descriptive with little analysis or explanation, good answers, 18–20, will be mostly analytical with good quality supporting evidence, while high quality answers, 21–25, will be consistently analytical and in full control of the argument.

**5 Consider the view that the dramatic legal gains for African-Americans from 1945 to 1968 did little in practice to improve their social and economic position.**

This question will be very popular and to obtain high marks (18–25) analysis, relevance, and good supporting material are essential. The legal and constitutional gains are easy to chronicle, starting with the Brown case and leading up to the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and the Constitutional Amendment which banned the Poll tax and similar devices. What is essential is to focus the emphasis on the social and economic advances (if any) of African-Americans, resulting from these gains. The best answers will avoid generalisations and focus on specific questions; how many African American officers were there in the armed forces? How many Presidents or Vice Presidents of leading companies? How many partners in the Wall Street law firms? How many students in the Ivy League universities? How many black millionaires outside traditional fields such as black undertakers catering exclusively for black funerals. Better answers should distinguish between those appointed or promoted on merit and those by affirmative action programmes or ethnic quotas. In economic terms, a black middle class emerged living in racially integrated suburbs but the phenomenon of the large black underclass trapped in a cycle of one-parent families, gangs, drugs, prison, unemployment seemed to remain constant. It should be pointed out that the question ends at 1968, when some of the most important legal and constitutional gains had only occurred earlier in the decade. A fair response would be that the legal gains opened the gateways to the most talented but barely touched the basic problem of African-American deprivation. Bare pass answers, 11–15 will be descriptive, with little analysis or explanation, good answers, 18–20, will be mostly analytical with good quality supporting evidence, while high quality answers, 21–25, will be consistently analytical and in full control of the argument.

<b>Page 10</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

**6 How far did Roosevelt's second term of office demonstrate that critics of the New Deal had been right all along?**

Relevance is the key factor here. FDR's second term had begun in January 1937 with unprecedented victories in 46 of the 48 states. There were huge Democratic majorities in both Houses of Congress. The second New Deal is usually characterised as more radical than his first term, being less concerned with relief and recovery and more focussed on social and economic reform. A new relief agency, the Works Progress Administration, was set up which ended up employing eight and a half million people on a wide range of projects. Collective bargaining of trade unions was sanctioned by law and a social security act provided a national system of old age pensions and unemployment insurance. However, no payments could be made until 1942. Nevertheless, the verdict of historians is that the second term amounted to very little in terms of reducing the vast unemployment problem and partial recovery ended in 1937 with a sudden downward plunge of the economy. Federal spending was actually cut in the budget and it was clear that the New Deal had run out steam.

To say that this proved the critics of the New Deal correct is an over simplification. The critics on the Right were hard core conservatives objecting to Federal management of the economy and organisations such as the Liberty League, claiming that the New Deal was a threat to the American free enterprise system. Significantly, no alternative range of measures was suggested of any consequence. More interesting were the radical critics urging more drastic measures on FDR and accusing him of timidity. While some of these, such as Huey Long's scheme of a guaranteed minimum wage and limiting personal fortunes were interesting, it was impossible to see any of these schemes being passed by Congress e.g. Dr Townsend's call for a Federal monthly pension of \$200, providing it was all spent within the month. Challenges in the courts would have been certain and business confidence might well have collapsed. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that though the second phase of the New Deal was chaotic and confusing, it was nevertheless the only set of measures which could realistically be applied. It remains nevertheless, a fact that only rearmament and the European war brought the Great Depression to an end. Bare pass answers, 11–15, will be descriptive with little analysis or explanation, good answers, 18–20, will be mostly analytical with good quality supporting evidence, while high quality answers, 21–25, will be consistently analytical and in full control of the argument.

**7 To what extent was isolationism the key doctrine of US foreign policy, 1919-1941?**

It is first necessary to define isolationism. It did not mean non-involvement in the affairs of other countries, but rather refusing to enter into alliances with foreign powers which might tie America's hands in any future conflict. US entry into World War 1 from 1917 was, of course, a complete rejection of this doctrine and President Wilson had become obsessed with a League of Nations with the US occupying a leading role which in practice would involve America in intervening in European affairs. It should also be noted that in 1905 President Theodore Roosevelt had arbitrated successfully in the war between Russia and Japan. From 1920 onwards there was a sharp reaction against internationalism and the Versailles Treaty was rejected along with the League of Nations. However, it should be noted that America in the 1920s pursued an independent and innovative foreign policy such as the Kellog-Briand Pact which outlawed war and the Washington Naval Agreement between Britain, US and Japan. There was always an American judge on the International Court of Justice and American observers were active in the International Labour Organisation and other League committees. In so far as there was an isolationist policy it was in the 1930s when America became preoccupied with its own domestic problems, including protectionist policies which reduced world trade. Even when it became clear that the three aggressor nations, Japan, Germany and Italy were disregarding international law by highly aggressive policies and getting away with it, the American reaction was to pass the three Neutrality Acts which were to prevent any American assistance to belligerents in war. FDR had paid little attention to foreign affairs until 1938 but from then on was doing all he could assist Britain and France, short of warfare. By 1941 when Japan attacked Pearl Harbour and Germany and Italy declared war on the US, America had been committed for two years to helping Britain

<b>Page 11</b>	<b>Mark Scheme</b>	<b>Syllabus</b>	<b>Paper</b>
	<b>GCE A LEVEL – October/November 2008</b>	<b>9697</b>	<b>05</b>

avoid defeat at the hands of Germany by all means short of American military involvement. Good answers will note the complexity of American policy in this period, avoiding vague generalisations. Bare pass answers, 11–15, will be descriptive with little analysis or explanation, good answers, 18–20, will be mostly analytical with good quality supporting evidence, while high quality answers, 21–25, will be consistently analytical and in full control of the argument.

## **8 How far did the role of women in US society change from 1945 to 1968?**

These questions are rarely answered with any detail. By 1945 women had had the vote for 25 years and were occupying public offices, e.g. Frances Perkins was in Roosevelt's cabinet. American women had worked in factories and wartime industries in very large numbers and this participation in the labour force continued after 1945. In particular women came in ever larger numbers to study in universities. The age of marriage for women became later. Divorce became generally acceptable though still a barrier to holding elected office. However, in the 1950s American society was still dominated by men at every level, including the professions. This was to change in the 1960s in the general wave of radicalisation arising out of the Civil Rights struggles of African-Americans and protests against the Vietnam war. These protest movements gave rise to the phenomenon known initially as Women's Liberation, where the main focus was on women striking out an independent social role and not seeking the approval of men. The French writer Simone de Beauvoir in her book *The Second Sex* became very influential and American feminists such as Betty Friedan and Gloria Steinem applied these principles in a more radical and American context. It was quite clear that by 1968 the role of women in America had changed dramatically in a great many respects and that this process was set to continue in future decades. Bare pass answers, 11–15, will be descriptive with little analysis or explanation, good answers, 18–20, will be mostly analytical with good quality supporting evidence, while high quality answers, 21–25, will be consistently analytical and in full control of the argument.