History
Advanced
Unit 3
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You must have:
Sources Insert (enclosed)

Instructions
• Use black ink or ball-point pen.
• Fill in the boxes at the top of this page with your name, centre number and candidate number.
• There are two sections in this question paper. Answer one question from Section A and one question from Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.
• Answer the questions in the spaces provided – there may be more space than you need.

Information
• The total mark for this paper is 70.
• The marks for each question are shown in brackets – use this as a guide as to how much time to spend on each question.
• The quality of your written communication will be assessed in all your responses – you should take particular care with your spelling, punctuation and grammar, as well as the clarity of expression.

Advice
• Read each question carefully before you start to answer it.
• Check your answers if you have time at the end.
6HI03/C – The United States: Challenged and Transformed

SECTION A

Answer ONE question in Section A on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section A on page 3. Section B begins on page 11.

C1 – The United States, 1820–77: A Disunited Nation?

Answer EITHER Question 1 OR Question 2.

EITHER

1 ‘In the years 1820–60 slavery offered the Southern states few economic benefits.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   
   (Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 ‘Ulysses Grant’s Presidency (1869–77) was a complete failure.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   
   (Total for Question 2 = 30 marks)

C2 – The United States, 1917–54: Boom, Bust and Recovery

Answer EITHER Question 3 OR Question 4.

EITHER

3 How far did the USA, in the years 1919–29, suffer from heightened political and social tensions?
   
   (Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 ‘US prosperity in the years 1945–54 was entirely due to the effects of the war of 1941–45.’
   How far do you agree with this view?
   
   (Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS
SECTION A

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ✗ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 ☐ Question 2 ☐
Question 3 ☐ Question 4 ☐
(Section A continued)
SECTION B

Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

You should start the answer to your chosen question in Section B on page 13.

C1 – The United States, 1820–77: A Disunited Nation?

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.

Answer EITHER Question 5 OR Question 6.

EITHER

5 Use Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge.

‘The main cause of the American Civil War was the economic clash between the Northern and Southern elites.’

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 1, 2 and 3 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 5 = 40 marks)

OR

6 Use Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge.

‘The Union won the Civil War primarily because of the military skills of Grant and Sherman.’

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using the evidence of Sources 4, 5 and 6 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 6 = 40 marks)
C2 – The United States, 1917–54: Boom, Bust and Recovery

Study the relevant sources in the Sources Insert.
Answer EITHER Question 7 OR Question 8.

EITHER

7  Use Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge.

‘America was hit by the Great Depression in the years 1929–33 mainly due to international economic problems.’

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 7, 8 and 9 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 7 = 40 marks)

OR

8  Use Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge.

‘The New Deal, in the years 1933–39, benefited most groups in American society.’

How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using Sources 10, 11 and 12 and your own knowledge of the issues related to this controversy.

(Total for Question 8 = 40 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
SECTION B

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☑️. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☑️.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 5 ☐ Question 6 ☐
Question 7 ☐ Question 8 ☐
Sources for use with Section B. Answer ONE question in Section B on the topic for which you have been prepared.

C1 – The United States, 1820–77: A Disunited Nation?

Sources for use with Question 5

SOURCE 1
(From Howard Zinn, A People’s History of the United States, published 2005)

Behind the secession of the South from the Union was a long series of policy clashes between South and North. The clash was not over slavery as a moral institution – most northerners did not care enough about slavery to make sacrifices for it, certainly not the sacrifice of war. It was not a clash of peoples. Most northern whites were not economically favoured, nor politically powerful; most southern whites were poor farmers, not decision makers. It was a clash of elites. The northern elite wanted economic expansion – free land, free labour, a free market, a high protective tariff for manufacturers and a bank of the United States. The slave interests opposed all that; slave owners saw Lincoln and the Republicans as making continuation of their pleasant and prosperous way of life impossible in the future.

SOURCE 2

There was the issue of state sovereignty versus a strong federal government. At bottom, this was a contest over control of national policy in regard to such things as banking measures, tariffs, internal improvements, and especially slavery. If the Union was a voluntary federation of sovereign states, with the important powers residing within them, the whole course of national policy followed the Southern path. If the Constitution created a perpetual, tightly-bound union with a strong national government, the Southern cause was lost. In effect, the war was truly a civil war, fought to decide which theory of government should become the basis of future national policy.

SOURCE 3
(From David Reynolds, America, Empire of Liberty: A New History, published 2009)

Under the pressure of events like Bleeding Kansas and Harper’s Ferry, the Democratic Party – that last political bridge spanning the Union – split into Northern and Southern wings. This was enough to give victory in the 1860 election to the Republicans, now led by Lincoln, who won virtually no votes in the South. In other words, there were no longer any parties that constituted nationwide coalitions. Southern extremists presented Lincoln’s victory as the triumph of abolitionists – intent, like John Brown, on freeing the slaves. As many historians have argued, this was in many ways an irrepressible conflict. So the house finally divided. As Lincoln prophesied, liberty and slavery, like oil and water, could not coexist. The South wanted to establish its own house, founded on slavery, but the North would not let it go – determined that the Union should remain whole and united.
C1 – The United States, 1820–77: A Disunited Nation?

Sources for use with Question 6

SOURCE 4
(From John Keegan, *The American Civil War*, published 2009)

In the West, Grant won success by risk-taking and unceasing aggressiveness, but his soldiers paid the price. Most of Grant’s battles were costly in casualties. He retained nevertheless his men’s confidence and devotion, and eventually he came to be almost revered by his soldiers. It was greatly to Grant’s advantage that he was served by talented subordinates with whom he established cordial personal relations. That was particularly so with Sherman. A sort of alternative Grant, Sherman had the same aggressiveness and relentlessness, though he went even further than Grant in his belief in the moral effect of offensive force on the enemy’s will to resist. Sherman and Grant were the two outstanding generals of the war. Close friends, with calm temperaments, they cooperated admirably and avoided quarrelling with others.

SOURCE 5
(From James A. Rawley, *Turning Points in the Civil War*, published 1989)

The predominance of the North in population and in financial and industrial strength was conspicuous. Twenty-three states, with a population of 22 million, stood arrayed against eleven states with a population of 9 million. The North also had a complex economy. Having reached take-off point in the 1840s, the industrial revolution surged forward in the North. By 1860 there were more factories in New England alone than in the whole of the South. Three-quarters of the USA’s railway mileage were located in the North and the nation’s banking institutions were concentrated in the north-east. In contrast, the South, a relatively simple agricultural economy, was an undeveloped area which lacked fluid capital and technology. In short, the South appeared woefully unprepared to wage a modern war. The North enjoyed the advantage in money, men, iron, food, railroads and ships.

SOURCE 6
(From an article by Alan Farmer, *Why was the Confederacy Defeated?*, published 2005)

To win, the Confederacy had to wear down Northern will – but Northern will endured. The morale of Union soldiers was crucial here. Soldiers’ letters suggest that Northern soldiers were aware of the issues at stake and passionately concerned about them. In 1864, some 80 per cent of Union soldiers voted for Lincoln, proof that soldier morale still held strong. Federal victories from mid-1863 onwards helped sustain that morale. The Confederacy surrendered in 1865 because Union armies had demonstrated their ability to crush Southern military resistance. Defeat caused defeatism, not vice versa. A people whose armies are beaten, railways wrecked, cities burned, countryside occupied and crops laid waste, lose their will – and ability – to continue fighting.
The world economy was largely stagnant in the 1920s, seriously limiting export markets for American goods, particularly American farm goods. The problem was exacerbated by the US policy of economic isolationism. The tariffs imposed in 1922 and 1930 made it nearly impossible for foreigners to earn the dollars that would enable them to buy American goods. Furthermore, the US government’s inflexible attitude towards repayment of the massive war debts owed by European nations ensured that a large part of the dollars that they did earn would be devoted to that end. The international system depended heavily on flows of American capital, and was therefore highly vulnerable to a reduction of capital flows after October 1929. The result was a disastrous sequence of financial crises in Europe beginning in the summer of 1931, shock-waves from which set off renewed deflationary pressures within the United States.

What caused the Depression? The deepest problem was federal intervention and the lack of faith in the marketplace. Government management of the late 1920s and 1930s hurt the economy. Hoover stumbled in various ways. He ordered wages up when they wanted to go down. He allowed the disastrous Smoot-Hawley tariff to become law when he should have had the sense to block it. He raised taxes when neither citizens individually nor the economy as a whole could afford the change. After 1932, New Zealand, Japan, Greece, Romania, Chile, Denmark, Finland, and Sweden began seeing industrial production levels rise again – but not the United States.
Economists probing the depression's underlying causes focus on structural problems that made 1920s' prosperity highly unstable. Agriculture remained depressed throughout the decade. In industry, wage increases lagged behind factory output, reducing consumer purchasing power. At the same time, assembly-line methods encouraged overproduction. By summer 1929, housing, automobile, textile, tyre, and other major industries were seriously overextended. Key industries such as railroads, steel, textiles, and mining lagged technologically and lacked the investment needed to stimulate recovery. Monetarist economists also blame the Federal Reserve's tight-money policies in the early 1930s. These policies, they argue, strangled any hope of recovery by reducing the capital available to businesses for investment and growth. All analysts link the U.S. depression to a global economic crisis. European economies, struggling with war-debt payments and a severe trade imbalance with the United States, collapsed in 1931, crippling the U.S. export market.
Defenders of the New Deal note that economic conditions steadily improved through most of the 1930s. More importantly, the New Deal provided millions of Americans with the assistance they needed to weather the storms of the Great Depression until the United States could regain its economic footing. The groups who benefited most from the New Deal included working-class people, farmers, elderly and disabled people, and union members. But perhaps no other group was lifted up by the New Deal as much as black Americans. Although their calls for increased civil rights went mostly unmet during the Roosevelt years, the President made special efforts to ensure blacks could partake in the economic opportunities that were made available through the TVA, the WPA, the CCC, and many other Depression-era work programmes.

New Deal programs pumped money into the economy and saved millions of Americans from hunger and misery. However, as late as 1939, over 10 million men and women were still jobless, and the nation’s unemployment rate stood at 19 per cent. In the end, it was not the New Deal but massive government spending during the Second World War that brought full economic recovery. In 1941, as a result of mobilization for war, unemployment declined to 10 per cent, and in 1944 only 1 per cent of the labour force was jobless. Nevertheless, during the 1930s, the federal government guaranteed workers’ right to join unions without fear of employer reprisals, and federal law required employers to negotiate with workers’ unions to set wages, hours, and working conditions. Many unemployed workers, elderly and disabled Americans, and dependent children were also protected by a national welfare system, administered through the federal government.

While slum dwellers received little besides relief from the New Deal, and their needs were frequently misunderstood, black Americans as a group received even less assistance – less than they needed and sometimes even less than their proportion in the population would have justified. Under the NRA they were frequently dismissed and their wages were sometimes below the legal minimum. The Civilian Conservation Corps left them “forgotten” men – excluded, discriminated against, segregated. In general, what the black Americans gained – relief, WPA jobs, equal pay on some federal projects – was granted them as poor people, not as black Americans. Even less bold than in economic reform, the New Deal left intact the race relations of America.