Write your name here

Surname	Other names

Centre Number | Candidate Number

Edexcel GCE

History

Advanced
Unit 3
Option C: The United States: Challenged and Transformed

Friday 10 June 2011 – Afternoon
Time: 2 hours

Paper Reference
6HI03/C

You must have:
Sources Insert (enclosed)

Total Marks

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.

Turn over ▶

P36357A

©2011 Edexcel Limited.

1/1/1/

P 3 6 3 5 7 A 0 1 2 4

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

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 'The Missouri Compromise succeeded in minimising divisions between the north and south in the years 1820–50.' How far do you agree with this view?

(Total for Question 1 = 30 marks)

OR

2 'Reconstruction (1865–77) promised much for African-Americans but ultimately failed them.' 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 do you agree with the view that, in the 1920s, the Ku Klux Klan possessed neither sizeable support nor significant influence?

(Total for Question 3 = 30 marks)

OR

4 'American prosperity in the years 1945–54 was primarily due to the impact of the US war economy.' 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 A continued)

(Section A continued)

(Section A continued)

(Section A continued)

(Section A continued)

(Section A continued)

(Section A continued)

TOTAL FOR SECTION A = 30 MARKS

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 North and South went to war in 1861 over the issue of slavery.' How far do you agree with this opinion?

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.

How far do you agree that Southern disunity was the main factor explaining the defeat of the Confederacy in the American Civil War?

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.

'President Hoover's policies and attitudes in the years 1929–33 merely prolonged the impact of the Depression in the USA.' How far do you agree with this opinion?

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.

How far do you agree with the view that, in the years 1933–40, the New Deal did little to improve social and economic conditions in the USA?

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** ☐

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

(Section B continued)

TOTAL FOR SECTION B = 40 MARKS
TOTAL FOR PAPER = 70 MARKS

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

Edexcel GCE

History

Advanced
Unit 3
Option C: The United States: Challenged and Transformed

? ? June 2011 – ?
Sources Insert – Section B

Paper Reference
6HI03/C

Do not return the insert with the question paper.

Turn over ▶

N36357A

©2011 Edexcel Limited.

1/1/

N 3 6 3 5 7 A

edexcel
advancing learning, changing lives

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 Hugh Brogan, *The Penguin History of the USA*, 2nd edition, published 1999)

In the end, all the analyses come back to slavery. The commitment of the South to its 'peculiar institution' created not only a persecution complex; it turned the South into its own nation. For more than a generation, the South had been bringing its religion, culture, politics and trade into line. The same test was applied to everything, even to thought: was it consistent with slavery, did it build up the defences of a slave society? It was this obsession which had destroyed the two-party system in the Deep South and given the fire-eaters a clear field in which to promote secession, and the idea of a new Southern nation. By 1859–60 this new Southern nationalism was merely looking for an excuse to break the Union: John Brown, and then Abraham Lincoln, did no more than provide it.

SOURCE 2
(From Paul Johnson, *A History of the American People*, published 1997)

Slavery was not the only issue between North and South. Indeed, an attempt at secession might have been made even if the slavery issue had been resolved. The North favoured high tariffs, the South low ones; the North, in consequence, backed indirect taxation, the South direct taxation. Increasingly, the railroad interests of the Northeast and the Northwest came into alignment in the 1850s, and this in turn led to an alliance between Eastern manufacturers seeking high tariffs and Western farmers demanding low-cost or free lands – both linked by lines of rail. This was the basis of the power of the new Republican Party, and the South saw it as a plot. Many Southerners believed deeply in their hearts that the moral indignation of the North was bogus, masking meaner economic motives.

SOURCE 3
(From Reid Mitchell, *The American Civil War 1861–1865*, published 2001)

Only in a rough way can it be said that secession led to war. Although the North's decision to go to war now seems inevitable, it was no such thing. Initially, the South had reason to believe that the North would allow an independent Confederacy. However, Lincoln's inauguration and the subsequent firing on Fort Sumter changed the popular mood. Lincoln insisted that the federal government would maintain its rights and responsibilities in the so-called Confederacy. Without Union, he believed, American freedom would be destroyed by anarchy and tyranny. Democracy depended on the minority submitting to the majority, particularly when it was declared by an open honest election. Furthermore, Lincoln, and many other Unionists, thought secession was a bluff.

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

Sources for use with Question 6

SOURCE 4
(From George Brown Tindall and David Emory Shi, *America: A Narrative History*, 7th edition, published 2007)

Davis had to contend with dissenters. Especially troublesome were supporters of state rights and secession who steadfastly opposed the centralising tendencies of the Confederate government in Richmond. Georgia and North Carolina were strongholds of such sentiment. The states' rights champions challenged, among other things, the legality of conscription, taxes on farm produce, and above all the suspension of habeas corpus. Vice President Alexander Stephens himself carried on a running battle with Davis, accusing the president of trying to establish a military dictatorship. Whereas Lincoln was the skilful pragmatist, responsive to circumstances, Davis was inflexible and bad-tempered. Once he made a decision, nothing could change his mind. Nor could Davis ever admit a mistake. Such a personality was ill-suited to serve as the chief executive of the Confederacy.

SOURCE 5
(From Bruce Catton, *The Civil War*, published 1987)

The Federal government possessed enormous advantages in respect to manpower, riches, and the commercial and industrial strength that supports armies. In the North, there were over 18 million people; the South had hardly more than 9 million, of whom more than a third were slaves. Nine-tenths of the country's manufacturing capacity was situated in the North, which also had two-thirds of the railway mileage and nearly all of the facilities for building rails, locomotives, and wagons. The North contained most of the country's deposits of iron, coal, copper and precious metals. It controlled the seas and had access to European factories; it was also producing a huge surplus of foodstuffs which Europe greatly needed, and these would pay for enormous quantities of munitions. Taken altogether, these basic advantages were simply overpowering.

SOURCE 6
(From R. B. Nye and J. E. Morpurgo, *A History of the United States: The Growth of the USA,* 3rd edition, published 1970)

Grant was made for war; war gave him the stimulus that in peace had been provided by alcohol, and his cold and emotionless nature exactly suited the business of fighting. He had two qualities lacked by nearly every other commander in the North – he never made the same mistake twice, and he avoided politics like the plague. He had a common sense, a directness of mind, and a tenacity that set him apart as a great military commander. It is significant that Sherman and Sheridan, the two finest combat officers in the North, idolised him, and that Lee held him in the highest respect. Five Union generals broke themselves on Lee, who out-generalled and outmanoeuvred each in turn, until the appearance of Grant – whom Lee could never quite fathom.

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

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

Sources for use with Question 7

SOURCE 7
(From Michael E. Parrish, *Anxious Decades: America in Prosperity and Depression, 1920–1941*, published 1992)

Hoover remained convinced that he was right and usually treated most professional politicians in both parties with contempt. This proved to be a near-fatal flaw at a time when the economic crisis required maximum cooperation between President and Congress. Although a trained engineer and businessman, accustomed to looking facts squarely in the eye, Hoover finally shrank from the grim reality of the Depression. He retreated near the end into a fantasy world, where soothing words were used to paper over the accumulating evidence of disaster. When his policies of self-help and voluntary cooperation failed again and again, he stubbornly refused to change course. His words began to depreciate as rapidly as a collapsing rural bank, and he lost the most precious political asset in a democracy: trust and credibility.

SOURCE 8
(From James T. Patterson, *America in the Twentieth Century*, 5th edition, published 2000)

Few Americans seemed better qualified to deal with hard times than Herbert Hoover but he pursued some harmful policies. One of these was the Hawley-Smoot Tariff, which he signed in 1930 despite the advice of most economists. This tariff provoked sharp retaliation from other countries: America's exports were cut in half between 1930 and 1932. He also resisted congressional attempts to provide more substantial farm relief and, until mid-1932, blocked direct aid to the unemployed. His tenacious defence of the gold standard and balanced budgets prevented him from devaluing the dollar to promote American exports. Hoover's stance on all these issues stemmed from his belief in self-reliance, minimal government intervention and the essential strength of US capitalism.

SOURCE 9
(From William E. Leuchtenburg, *The Perils of Prosperity 1914–1932*, 2nd edition, published 1993)

Hoover has been denounced by his critics as a tool of Wall Street and as a 'do nothing' President. He was neither. He strongly disapproved of the bankers' insistence on deflation, and he used government power to check the Depression in an unprecedented manner, though still too modestly. The President stepped up federal construction, urged state and local governments to accelerate spending, and gained promises of increased capital investment from the railroads and the utilities. He obtained a pledge from leading businessmen to maintain wage rates. Earlier in 1929, Congress had passed the Agricultural Marketing Act, which aimed to stabilise agriculture through federal encouragement of farm cooperatives. By 1930, a Grain Stabilisation Corporation and a Cotton Stabilisation Corporation were intervening in the market to bolster prices.

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

Sources for use with Question 8

SOURCE 10
(From Robert Harrison, *State and Society in Twentieth Century America*, published 1997)

Critics have pointed out the limitations of New Deal reform. It brought only partial recovery, with 8 million still unemployed at the end of the decade, real incomes barely creeping back to the levels of 1929 and private investment still sluggish. It failed to cure poverty and social injustice. The plight of blacks, slum-dwellers, tenant farmers and other disadvantaged groups was little altered. The New Deal welfare state did little to redistribute income or reduce inequality, and, rather than showering its benefits equally, devoted its principal efforts to securing the livelihood of middle-income groups. New Deal farm policy acted principally to encourage the restoration of commercial agriculture and did little to challenge inequality and exploitation on the land. By the late 1930s, opinion polls showed declining support for new legislation in almost all sections of the population.

SOURCE 11
(From Peter Fearon, *War, Prosperity and Depression: The US Economy, 1917–45*, published 1987)

Any evaluation of the New Deal must take stock of the state of the nation in 1933. The business and banking communities were stricken with fear; the public, too, were close to despair. If Roosevelt had failed to raise morale, the economic collapse could have been complete. The restoration of hope must be amongst the President's greatest triumphs, together with the salvation of America's financial system. Although much of what followed was contradictory and hindered recovery, there is much to praise and even admire. The special programmes, for example those relating to rural rehabilitation, were motivated by compassion. The founding of a more equitable system of welfare benefited millions in the long run. Federal involvement in relief was essential to relieve suffering.

SOURCE 12
(From Eric Rauchway, *The Great Depression And The New Deal*, published 2008)

The New Deal did not end the Great Depression. As one American who lived through the 1930s said, 'the industries which were needed to make guns for World War Two made that happen'. Unemployment did not return to its 1929 level until 1943. But while we can therefore say that the New Deal did not finish the job, we cannot say that it was not working. Throughout the 1930s, with the exception of the recession in 1937–38, the economy was improving – growing on average 8 per cent a year from 1933–37 and 10 per cent a year from 1938–41, while unemployment fell steadily as well. This impressive rate of recovery reminds us how far the United States had to go to recover from the Hoover era.

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE

BLANK PAGE