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.
- Keep an eye on the time.
- Check your answers if you have time at the end.
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 ‘Between 1820 and 1860 there were few fundamental differences between the economies of the North and South.’ How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 How far do you agree with the view that, in the years 1829–37, President Andrew Jackson ‘democratised’ American politics?

(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 ‘The US economic boom of the 1920s was primarily due to the motor manufacturing industry.’ How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 ‘Neither the Supreme Court nor Roosevelt’s critics exerted much influence over the nature of the New Deal in the 1930s.’ How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 4 = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS
SECTION A

Put a cross in the box indicating the first question you have chosen to answer □. If you change your mind, put a line through the box □ and then put a cross in another box □.

Chosen Question Number:

Question 1 □ Question 2 □
Question 3 □ Question 4 □
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 primary cause of the American Civil War was Southern secession.’ 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.

‘Superior political leadership was the main reason for the Union’s victory in the American Civil War.’ How far do you agree with this view?

Explain your answer, using 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.

How far do you agree with the view that the USA was hit by a major economic downturn in 1929–30 because, by then, America no longer possessed ‘the capacity to consume’ (Source 7, line 10)?

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 failed to revive the US economy.’ 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

Put a cross in the box indicating the second question you have chosen to answer. If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then put a cross in another box.

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 Brian Holden Reid, The Origins of the American Civil War, published 1996)

1 The manner in which Southern state secessions were carried out threatened war. Separatism itself does not lead to war; but secession almost always does. And in the case of 1860–61 secession led to anarchy in the United States, with no coherent programme of government or plan. This was accompanied by rapid increase in armaments among the seceded states. It is as well to recall that the Confederacy opened fire on Fort Sumter before Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina and Arkansas had seceded. This was a rash, ill-thought-out act of foolishness, but characteristic of the recklessness that secession had created. The casual attitude of secessionists to the use of force (which so contrasts with the agonising of the Buchanan and Lincoln administrations) was the product of an attitude of mind that did not envisage war as a thing of armies and organised destruction, but of casual gatherings of romantic adventurers and warriors who ‘whipped’ the enemy. This is a supremely important factor that explains the coming of war in 1861. It is often overlooked.

SOURCE 2
(From an article by John Spicer, The Cause of the American Civil War, published 2004)

15 The causes of the American Civil War can perhaps be linked to one particular issue – that of slavery. It can be argued that slavery played a part in every pre-war crisis, and that even where other factors have been put forward by historians they are in some way linked to slavery. The causes of secession are not necessarily the same as the causes of the war itself, but the slavery issue refused to go away. The main economic difference between North and South was slave labour, the key state right for most Southerners was the legality of slavery, and where agitators stirred up emotions they did so over the issue of slavery. If slavery had not existed in the Southern states, is it then possible to imagine that a war would have happened?

SOURCE 3

25 The war, in the eyes of some ‘progressive’ historians, was a contest, not between slavery and freedom but between plantation agriculture and industrialising capitalism. Economic issues (such as the tariff and government subsidies to transportation and manufacturing) were really what divided the power-brokers – Northern manufacturers and Southern planters. The Confederacy could thus be seen as fighting for the preservation of a stable agrarian civilisation in the face of the grasping ambitions of Northern businessmen.
C1 – The United States, 1820–77: A Disunited Nation?

Sources for use with Question 6

SOURCE 4
(From an article by Richard Carwardine, *Abraham Lincoln, the Presidency and the mobilisation of Union sentiment*, published 2000)

What is remarkable about Lincoln's success in sustaining support for the Union's formidable four-year war effort is just how little it depended on government coercion and repression. The North's superiority over the Confederacy in manpower and resources gave hope of eventual victory, but this would only count if there was long-term enthusiasm for the fight. Without a clear statement of the war's purpose by Lincoln and others, it is doubtful whether the people of the North would have retained their collective will to continue so gruelling a conflict. One of Lincoln's greatest achievements was his justification for the war and its sacrifices. Based on his shrewd reading of public opinion, Lincoln's arguments appealed to mainstream Unionists and cemented the Northern war coalition.

SOURCE 5
(From Samuel Eliot Morison et al., *A Concise History of the American Republic*, published 1983)

The Confederacy laboured under political disadvantages. Its constitution had one fateful flaw; it took seriously the belief in state rights and so the Southern government proved to be distressingly weak. The Southern Confederacy was weakened by faction and shaken by a preoccupation with local concerns. Davis and most of the Southern leaders had been talking state rights but thinking Southern nationalism; yet many important Southerners loved state rights more than Southern unity and feared a tyranny at Richmond no less than they had at Washington. In 1861, few doubted that Davis was able and more experienced than Lincoln. Yet Davis infuriated the men who tried to work under him. In four years, the Davis cabinet had five attorneys-general and six secretaries of war. Nor did Davis win the affections of the public as Lincoln did.

SOURCE 6
(From George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, published 2007)

The Union had an edge of about four to one in potential human resources. An even greater advantage for the North was its industry. The states that joined the Confederacy produced just 7 per cent of the nation's manufactures on the eve of the war. The Union states produced 97 per cent of the firearms and 96 per cent of the railroad equipment. They had most of the trained mechanics and engineers, most of the shipping and mercantile firms, and the bulk of the banking and financial resources. The North's advantage in transportation weighed heavily as the war went on. The debate over why the North won and the South lost the Civil War will probably never end, but, as in other modern wars, firepower and manpower were essential factors.
C2 – The United States, 1917–54: Boom, Bust and Recovery

Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 7
(From Anthony J. Badger, The New Deal: The Depression Years 1933–1940, published 1989)

The lack of consumer purchasing power to sustain the growth of the 1920s seems clear enough. The agricultural sector was doing relatively badly. While average income rose by 28 per cent during 1920–29, farm incomes rose by only 10 per cent. The industrial and urban economy simply did not grow fast enough to absorb the surplus rural population. Nor did lower income workers share in the fruits of prosperity. Profits gained from rising productivity were not translated into higher wages. While the income of the top 1 per cent of the non-farm population almost doubled, that of the lower 93 per cent rose only by 6 per cent. Structural poverty, irregular employment and low wages meant that America was a consumer society without the capacity to consume.

SOURCE 8
(From David Reynolds, America, Empire of Liberty: A New History, published 2009)

In itself the stock market crash of October 1929 was not decisive. Share prices had become vastly inflated and were ripe for correction; in any case, only about 1 per cent of the population owned stocks and shares in 1929. But millions of Americans had come to see the stock market as an indicator of the economy as a whole; with the future economic climate uncertain, they cut back on spending and avoided new debts. The result was a massive contraction of the whole economy, but particularly affected were the boom industries such as cars and electrical goods and, in turn, the rubber and steel manufacturers that supplied them. In 1930 spending on consumer goods fell by a catastrophic 20 per cent. As factories closed and workers were laid off, the ripples were felt in mill towns and mining communities, in Main Street’s shops and eateries.

SOURCE 9
(From David J. Goldberg, Discontented America: The United States in the 1920s, published 1999)

The Great Depression exposed weaknesses in the business system that Democrats and Republicans had ignored in the 1920s. Both farmers and workers lacked adequate purchasing power to buy the goods produced by American industry. Industrialists’ success in preventing unionisation meant that wages lagged behind profits, despite huge gains in productivity. The failure of Europe to recover from the First World War – a failure partly caused by the United States’ narrow-minded economic policies – limited the foreign markets that could be tapped. The federal government’s taxation policies distributed income upward and the failure to regulate Wall Street encouraged the vast increase in share prices in the late 1920s.
C2 – The United States, 1917–54: Boom, Bust and Recovery

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From Paul Johnson, A History of the American People, published 1997)

The New Deal recovery was slow and feeble. The only reasonably good year was 1937 when unemployment stood at 14.3 per cent, but by the end of the year the economy was in free-fall again, and unemployment was at 19 per cent in 1938. In 1937 production briefly passed 1929 levels but soon slipped below again. The real recovery came only when news of the war in Europe plunged the New York Stock Exchange into a joyful confusion which finally wiped out the traces of October 1929. Two years later, with America on the brink of war itself, production finally passed 1929 levels for good. If government interventionism worked, it took nine years and a world war to demonstrate the fact.

SOURCE 11
(From Amity Shlaes, The Forgotten Man: A New History of the Great Depression, published 2007)

Roosevelt created relief, aid and regulatory agencies, assuming that recovery could be achieved only through large military-style effort. Some were useful, such as the financial institutions he established upon entering office. Some were inspiring – the Civilian Conservation Corps, for example. Other institutions such as the National Recovery Agency (NRA) did damage. NRA rules were so inflexible they frightened away capital and discouraged employers from hiring workers. Where the private sector could help to bring the economy back, Roosevelt often suppressed it. The creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority snuffed out a growing – and potentially successful – private sector effort to light up the South. The high wages generated by New Deal legislation helped those workers who earned them but also prevented companies from hiring additional workers. Hence the persistent shortage of jobs in the latter part of the 1930s.

SOURCE 12
(From Philip Jenkins, A History of the United States, published 1997)

The New Deal had its greatest success in Roosevelt’s first term. Between 1930 and 1933 the gross national product (GNP) of the US had fallen from $99 billion to $77 billion – a figure which more than bounced back to $113 billion by 1937. GNP per head rose from $615 in 1933 to $881 in 1937, and to $954 by 1940. People also became significantly better off as the decade progressed, as measured by possession of material goods. However, in some ways the New Deal only softened the worst effects of the crisis. Unemployment remained at 16–20 per cent for most of the late 1930s. Even in 1937, unemployment only just dipped below 8 million, and 1938 brought a brief but painful economic contraction. Moreover, the financial costs were immense: the federal debt grew from $22.5 billion in 1933 to $40.5 billion in 1939.
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