

Examiners' Report  
June 2014

GCE History 6HI03 C

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).



### Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2014

Publications Code UA039096

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

## Introduction

The paper was divided into two sections: Section A was an In-Depth Study question, and Section B an Associated Historical Controversy question. As expected, there were far more entrants for *C2 – The United States, 1917-54: Boom, Bust and Recovery* than for *C1 – The United States, 1820-77: A Disunited Nation?*

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses in this examination series. Many candidates wrote insightful comments and very few candidates produced essays which were devoid of analysis. Unfortunately, some candidates continue to write too much generalised comment. As a consequence, their responses lacked precise analytical focus and detailed supporting evidence. Examiners want to see that candidates can use the sources and their own material effectively to answer the questions set.

The main weakness in responses which scored less well tended to be a lack of sufficient knowledge, rather than lengthy descriptive writing without analysis. The paper provided candidates with the opportunity to develop their essay writing and to include source material as and when necessary.

There appears to be an increasing tendency for candidates to analyse and produce judgements in the main body of the answer and have cursory conclusions. Candidates can indeed sustain arguments by these means and this approach does not, in itself, prevent access to the highest levels. However, in some cases, judgements on individual issues and factors tended to be somewhat isolated, and ultimate conclusions were either only partially stated or implicit. Consequently, candidates should be aware that considered introductions and conclusions often provide a solid framework for sustained argument and evaluation.

The answers of a minority of less successful candidates in Section A suggested that they lacked the detailed knowledge base required to tackle these questions and produced a catch-all commentary on the stipulated topic. The best answers to these questions – and indeed those on the 1820-77 option – showed some impressive study of 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century American history, with students producing incisive, scholarly analysis.

When attempting the Section B questions, a small number of candidates engaged more with the general debate of the set controversy, rather than the specific demands of the question and source package. This was most evident on Question 7, although it was still a small minority.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers is more than enough for full marks.

Although a few responses were quite brief, there was little evidence on this paper of candidates having insufficient time to answer both questions.

## Question 1

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss some of the reasons why North-South relations deteriorated so sharply in the years 1850-57. The weakest candidates tended to produce: (1) a descriptive account of this period which did not address the question; (2) a response which was heavily reliant on unsupported assertions. A few very low scoring answers strayed outside the time frame contained in the question. Conversely, the best responses offered a sustained evaluation of the reasons for the deterioration. These included the weaknesses of the 1850 Compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Bill (1854), growing Northern concerns about a 'slave power conspiracy', the impact of Republican-Democrat political realignment in the 1850, the impact of Bleeding Kansas (1856) and the Supreme Court decision in the Dred Scott case (1857).

Plan → 1850 Compromise + Uncle Tom

→ 1854 Kansas/Nebraska

→ 1857 Dred Scott

Relations between the North and the South deteriorated so sharply between 1850 and 1857 because attempts at compromise, mainly on the issue of slavery, failed to achieve their desired effect. The 1850 Compromise, the 1854 Kansas-Nebraska Act and the Dred Scott decision of 1857 all caused an increase of tension between the North and the South, and thus harmed relations between them.

One cause of a deterioration of relations between the North and the South was the 1850 Compromise. The purpose of the compromise was to try and find a peaceful way to accept California into the Union. However, the North's attempts to placate the South by re-introducing

[Section A continued] the Fugitive Slave Act backfired, as it brought Northerners into contact with the harsh reality of slavery for the first time. This had the effect of bringing more Northerners into the abolitionist camp, as they were horrified by the need to track down fugitive slaves. The Fugitive Slave Act also inspired Harriet Beecher-Stowe's book "Uncle Tom's Cabin" - much like the Fugitive Slave Act itself, the book brought many otherwise ignorant Northerners into contact with the cruelty of slavery. This increase in anti-slavery sentiment in the North caused tensions between the North and the South to increase, thus harming relations. As such, the 1850 Compromise, and in particular the clause concerning fugitive slaves, caused relations between the North and the South to deteriorate sharply.

Another issue that caused relations between the North and the South to deteriorate was the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. Pioneered by Stephen Douglas, the issue of whether the States of Kansas

(Section A continued) and Nebraska would be free or slave States and was decided by popular sovereignty, sparking the "Bleeding Kansas" disaster. Relations between the North and the South were estranged by the violence and tension in Kansas. It made it clear to both the North and the South how far the other would go to harm their interests. The fact that two governments were set up in Kansas amid the turmoil highlighted the issues between the North and the South and that they couldn't coexist effectively. This had a dramatic effect on increasing the tension between the North and South, and as such is one of the reasons why relations between the North and the South deteriorated sharply.

Finally, relations between the North and the South deteriorated due to the Dred Scott decision of 1857. The pro-slavery majority within the Supreme Court Judges, including Taney, the chief Judge, declared that slaves were property and could be taken ~~any~~ anywhere. This effectively

[Section A continued]

multified every compromise since 1820 and caused outrage in the North. The decision was a victory for the South, who could now set up plantations anywhere, but the vehement opposition ~~showed~~ to the decision by many Northerners, especially in the Republican Party, caused outrage in the South, especially with the plantation-owning elite. The anger expressed by both the North and the South did a great deal to damage relations, and as such the Dred Scott decision was one of the causes of the deterioration of relations between the North and South.

In conclusion, the relations between the North and South deteriorated sharply between 1850 and 1857 because attempts at compromise backfired. The 1850 Compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Act and the Dred Scott decision were all implemented as a means of solving the slavery question and thus were attempts to reduce sectional tension and improve relations. However, the ~~red~~ reactions to these attempts at compromise by the general populace in both the

(Section A continued) North and the South - violence, outrage and increased distrust - simply acted to harm relations between the two.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This high Level 3 response is broadly analytical, and attempts to address the question with moderate detail and development. The candidate puts forward three reasons (the 1850 Compromise, the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and the Dred Scott case) to explain why North-South relations deteriorated so sharply in the years 1850-57. Greater range and depth would have pushed this response into Level 4.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

If you use the key phrases from the question throughout your essay, this will help you to write a relevant analytical response.



## Question 2

In this question, most candidates were able to offer some assessment of success and failure under Reconstruction (1865-77) with particular emphasis placed on the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments, the Freedman's Bureau Act (1866) and the level of white discrimination (e.g. the 'black codes' and the KKK). Indeed, the strongest candidates demonstrated impressive range and depth in precisely focused answers. Weaker candidates tended to: (1) write a chronological narrative account of the main developments without relating them explicitly to the question; (2) stray outside the time frame of the question by commenting at length on developments during the Civil War.

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

Plan → Success for who? — blacks — Reconstruction ultimately failed the blacks  
 — white southerners — failure.

Success 1865-1870 — Freedom — share cropping  
 — Vote — Amnesty Act 1873  
 — Equality — Black Codes — KKK — 3/4 million members

~~Civil Rights Act 1866~~  
~~Freedman's Bureau~~ — Johnson didn't support.

Union

When looking at whether the successes of Reconstruction far outweighed its failures, it must be considered firstly what the aims were for reconstruction and secondly who reconstruction was a success for. We know that due to the Freedman's Bureau and the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment that procedures were put in place to help the freed slaves and poor white southerners. With regard to whether the successes of reconstruction far outweighed the failures for the freed slaves it can be confidently said that reconstruction

(Section A continued) Ultimately failed the Blacks' (Historian Alan Farmer). Furthermore looking at whether Reconstruction was a success for poorer white Southerners the failing of the Freedmans Bureau and eventual disbanding of it in 1872 illustrates how much of a failure Reconstruction was for them also. Therefore it can't be agreed that the successes of Reconstruction outweighed the failures in the failures in the years 1865-1877.

One success of the Reconstruction was clearly the Union being put back together. Ultimately this was the aim of the Civil War and Reconstruction. So in this case Reconstruction was a success, however it can be argued that although the Union was back together that this success cannot outweigh the failures of the rest of Reconstruction.

The Freedmans Bureau can be seen as a failure, originally set up at the end of the war by Lincoln, we know the aim was to help freed slaves and poorer white Southerners get their lives back on track. It aimed to do this by providing money, education and any support ~~to~~ families.

(Section A continued) required; such as rejoining separated slave families. However, lacking of support from Johnson meant the money was soon cut off and there is little evidence that families were ever rejoined. David Potter (Historian) points out however that the Bureau managed to set up universities that are still present day such as Howard and Fisk Universities. This could be deemed a success of the Bureau and furthermore a success of Reconstruction, however Alan Farmer (Historian) highlights that educational opportunities were still slim for freed slaves. Supporting that the Bureau's successes didn't far outweigh the failures.

Looking at reconstruction for the African-Americans it can't be ignored that a huge success for them was the Civil Rights acts and the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments. The slaves were free this was a huge success for reconstruction, although life didn't necessarily improve for the African-Americans. The 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment meant slaves were free however many African-Americans ended up working as 'share-croppers' on plantations. The economic decline in the South post-Civil

[Section A continued] War added to the failure of financial help from the Freedman Bureau. Recent employment opportunities were slim and those who were sharecroppers ended up in debt to white plantation owners. Therefore it can be questioned as to whether reconstruction was a success for the freed slaves, especially when one historian writes 'Share-cropping was just Slavery without the chains.' Supporting that the success of the 13<sup>th</sup> Amendment was in fact far outweighed by the failures of it. ~~##~~

The 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments were arguably no different. At first it could be seen that the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment was a success that outweighed the failures of reconstruction, many historians support this highlighting that it enabled African-Americans to have political representation from the Republican party. However this success was short-lived due to the Amnesty Act of 1872 ~~##~~ when 150,000 Confederate soldiers were given the vote back. This ended the successes of the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment for the Blacks. It could be argued that although the Amnesty act of 1872 was

(Section A continued) deemed as a failure for the Black it could be considered a success for the Southern Confederate Soliders as they regained the vote and their political representation. Highlighting that the failures may only have outweighed the successes for the African-Americans.

It can be concluded that reconstruction was a failure for white Southerners due to losing their slaves, the economic decline, and never returning 'King Cotton' to its former success. They did however have sharecroppers working on their land, but it can't be ignored that their economic state was ruined and the failures of the Freedman Bureau and the failures of the Banking system far outweighed any success of reconstruction for them in 1860-77. It can be argued however that the Compromise of 1877 favoured white Southerners far more than it did African-Americans. Therefore it can't be agreed that the successes of reconstruction far outweighed the failures for white Southerners or Northerners for that matter but it can be said that the failures weren't as fast

(Section A continued) for the white Southerners as they were African-Americans. Reconstruction failures far outweighed ~~the~~ successes for the African-Americans, that can be said ~~at~~ conclusively, and is further supported by Martin Luther King over 100 years later fighting for the equality promised by the 13<sup>th</sup>, 14<sup>th</sup>, and 15<sup>th</sup> Amendments. The African-Americans never got the equality they were promised and were constantly put down by Black Codes taking away their rights and furthermore tortured by the ~~the~~ KKK. The extent of this torture is illustrated by the number of Klansmen being 3-4 million during the reconstruction period of 1865-1877. Therefore it is not at all agreeable that the successes of reconstruction far outweighed the failures, especially not for African-Americans.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This candidate has produced a strong Level 4 answer by offering detailed knowledge within a focused analytical structure. The success/failure arguments are based on a range of key developments during Reconstruction (e.g. the Freedman's Bureau, the 13th, 14th and 15th constitutional amendments) and the conclusion offers a nuanced judgement on the debate.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

When answering an 'agree-disagree' question, make sure you consider both sides of the debate to give your response range.

### Question 3

This proved to be a very popular question. Most candidates who attempted Question 3 were able to discuss the role of developments in technology and manufacturing and to what extent they were responsible for the US economic boom of the 1920s. Stronger responses also considered the role played by other factors (such as government policy, the availability of easy credit and hire purchase, and the economic impact of the First World War) in promoting economic growth before making a judgement about relative importance. The best answers put forward a sustained analysis which critically assessed the role of developments in technology and manufacturing (set against other contributory factors) in generating the boom of the 1920s. Weaker responses tended to: (1) offer a general survey of the 1920s US economy which was not properly linked to the question; (2) concentrate almost exclusively on the stated factor.

It has been suggested that the US economic boom of the 1920's was mainly due to the developments in technology and manufacturing, however this may not be the case as other factors such as international relations and the role of women and immigrants could challenge this view. After a short recession once the first world war ended, the American economy boomed. Industry was stimulated, producing demand like Ford's automobile and the use of radio & other domestic goods such as refrigerators fridges proved popular. The developments in technology and manufacturing contributed immensely to American prosperity, however it was not the only factor, the First World War created a sense of growing nationalism in America so social groups worked together to an extent, providing an effective workforce. Other ~~deve~~ major countries that were involved in the war, owed millions of reparations to America for the damage they had caused. This increased the richness of

(Section A continued) America and therefore could spend reparations on building a more stable and prosperous economy and society. The first World War therefore can be seen as a contributing factor to the US economic boom of the 1920's.

Prohibition was passed in the 1920's via the Volstead Act, declaring America dry and alcohol free. The government ~~dear~~ thought the money saved by not buying alcohol would go towards developing the economy further. This proved a failure however, speakeasies were created to sell illegal alcohol. Massachusetts had 8,000 speakeasies as well as Boston having 4,000. Prohibition also increased crime rates, bootlegging became popular between Canada and Detroit and gangs formed. One specific gang was the "Italian Capone Gang" in which Al Capone was happily receiving \$60 million as an income. Therefore, Prohibition did not contribute ~~the~~ to the US economic boom of the 1920's to an extent, but money <sup>and businesses were</sup> ~~was~~ stimulated as the demand for alcohol increased.

The role of women ~~and~~ during and after the First World War changed their social and economic status. They were able to achieve the vote and often took on jobs of being secretaries and telephonists in commercial centres. While men were away



(Section A continued) at war, women had to take on jobs for them, mostly in the industries. This produced efficient weaponry such as aircrafts, and provided a new experience for women who had struggled with equality. Without the role of women therefore, industrial demand and the war effort would not have worked as effectively if women hadn't fulfilled their roles, so to an extent, the role of women contributed to the US economic boom of the 1920's.

Also, the news of this prosperous society attracted millions of immigrants across Europe. ~~Just~~ 2.3 million Jews escaping persecution in Russia, 2 million Italian Catholics, <sup>Blacks</sup> as well as Poles and many other Eastern Europeans. They contributed to bringing down the percentage of unemployed by filling job positions in the industry and creating businesses of their own. This helped to produce more consumer goods as the work force continuously increased. <sup>However</sup> ~~However~~, unfortunately for the immigrant community, this ~~rationalism~~ growing sense of nationalism created tensions between them and American citizens who questioned their loyalty to the United States. The ~~Red Scare~~ Communist threat had been existing in America ~~since the~~ ~~left~~ since it was created in politics. Many

(Section A continued) accused the immigrants of spying which lead to a torn society in the 1920's. Many immigrants were also involved in gang crimes such as Al Capone, and the Sacco e Vanzetti case. Therefore, despite being paid the lowest wages, immigrants did contribute to American prosperity in the 1920's, to an extent, however socially, tensions were building which didn't help reflect the US economic boom of the 1920's.

Ⓕ In conclusion, the development of technology and manufacturing in the 1920's did contribute the strongest by stimulating other industries such as ~~the~~ rubber and electrics. However other factors had a role in contributing to prosperity, such as the role of women and immigration. So the development of technology and manufacturing was a strong factor, but not the only factor that was mainly due to the economic boom of the 1920's.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This low Level 3 response is broadly analytical, and attempts to address the question, but offers limited detail and development. The candidate puts forward reasons for the US economic boom of the 1920s which are not always clearly explained or precisely linked to the question. Moreover, the stated factor is only briefly considered.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

To gain high marks on the Depth Study question you must have sound subject knowledge. Check the specification for the key topics.

## Question 4

This proved to be a question where a number of candidates were hampered by a lack of subject knowledge. Most responses were able to locate anti-communism within the context of early Cold War US politics and McCarthy's activities but some responses offered sketchy or inaccurate reasons for its impact on American society. The most common weaknesses were extended accounts of the Red Scare of the early 1920s which clearly indicated a lack of relevant knowledge and general 'Cold War' descriptions of the USA in the late 1940s and early 1950s with few reasons offered to explain why anti-communism had such a great effect on US society. Stronger candidates put forward a range of reasons based on growing fear of communism in the USA due to Cold War developments and the impact of McCarthy's anti-communist campaign.

~~Plan.~~

~~Technology + manufacturing~~

- ~~x rayon + synthetic fibres?~~
- ~~x mechanisation ✓ bad for farmers~~
- ~~x TV + radio - advertising.~~
- ~~x~~

Plan.

3 individuals: McCarthy <sup>JE Hoover</sup> 1950 Virginia State Dept

1 (ND) - TVA state rights, Wagner act  
SSA socialist, NRA interred  
Tydings Committee

2 Chase

Gold war - communism 10% of GNP.  
China + USSR bomb 49  
Space race

Internal suspicion  
Canadian Spy Ring 46 nuclear secrets.  
Federal Loyalty Bonds 47

Red under  
Bed.  
Rosenbergs 53  
Amenaria - from State Dept.

(Section A continued) From 1947 to 1954, America was impacted greatly by anti-communism. <sup>The</sup> This surge in anti-communist feelings were due to many different but interlinking factors. The <sup>New Deal,</sup> ~~role of individuals such as~~ ~~McCarthy,~~ the role of individuals such as McCarthy<sup>and</sup> America's 'traditional intolerance'. However the overarching factor was internal suspicions during this period that were heightened because of the onset of the cold war.

Firstly, anti-communism began affecting America so greatly due to the nature of Roosevelt's New Deal, and more specifically, his 'second New Deal' - a term coined by Schlesinger Jr. Many businessmen such as those associated with the American Liberty League accused the New Deal as promoting socialism and indeed communism within the USA. This was supported on the fact that the NRA and its 556 codes of conduct interfered with business<sup>one</sup>, the TVA directly impinged on States Rights, as did FERA. However, more significantly, Roosevelt's 'second New Deal' sparked outrage from ~~right-wing~~ businessmen such as Du Pont and US Steel. The SSA was criticised as condoning socialism and removing incentives to work, whereas the Wagner Act encouraged the growth of trade unions; union membership trebled in the New Deal period and

(Section A continued) as T Badger asserted "the gains were decisive and permanent". This clearly provides evidence for the anti-communist feeling amongst businessmen, however it was not the primary cause as it did not affect all of American society.

Another cause of anti-communist sentiments in the period 1947-54 was Chafe's theory of 'traditional intolerance'. The historian, Chafe suggests that Americans are inherently racist, xenophobic and intolerant. However, these unfavourable characteristics are controlled for most of the time however in periods of rapid stress or change, Americans contract "seasonal allergies" and their racism and prejudices are released among society, targeting those different to themselves. This is a credible reason for the increase in anti-communism during this period however it had to be triggered by a period of change, namely post-war America.

Anti-communist feelings were also fuelled by the <sup>new</sup> environment of post-war America. Many Americans struggled to cope with the drastic and permanent changes that had occurred

**Section A continued)** during the war. For example, women had become more independent and a larger section of the US workforce (6 million women joined workplaces during the war). With the lack of male role models and stricter rules on society (bars shut at midnight), teenagers had rebelled. ~~and~~ Furthermore, the development of technologies such as ~~the~~ computing and also <sup>new found</sup> the space industry triggered discomfort and disarray for many. Also, the 'white flight' or the expansion of the suburbs ~~and~~ caused tension and confusion for some as people became more insular, detached and less sociable. As people struggled to cope with these changes in society, many felt disenfranchised and uncomfortable in their own country. This led to the eruption of widespread 'seasonal allergies' as <sup>some</sup> people sought to reclaim control of their homeland by targeting unwanted political groups such as communism who threatened the capitalist fabric of American society. However, these changes and 'traditional intolerance' cannot themselves provide the main reasons for such a huge fear of ~~the~~ communism in America during this ~~time~~ period.

Anti-communist feelings were stirred up and intensified by ~~the~~ individuals. People such as McCarthy

(Section A continued) and J. Edgar Hoover succeeded in ~~maximising~~ magnifying anti-communist sentiments during the period also known as the 'Second Red Scare'. Joseph McCarthy's speech in Virginia in 1950 stated that he possessed a list of names of Communists in the US State Department. A quantity of 205 names, then 81, then 57, then 'a lot'. Although ~~that~~ <sup>these</sup> dubious claims seem preposterous to modern historians, in the context of the Second Red Scare, these claims were taken seriously. McCarthy, the ~~prize~~ 'witch-finder general' intensified the impact of anti-communism, however he and Hoover were not the principle reasons for the enormity of the Red Scare's impact.

America's involvement in the Cold War with Russia and the consequent development of internal suspicions were the main causes of the anti-communism in 1947-54 America. China turned Communist in 1949 under Mao Zedong and this worried America due to the 'domino theory'. According to this theory, Korea would be the next country susceptible to Communist revolution so America entered into the Korean War which spanned from 1950 to 1953. However, ~~territorial~~ <sup>territorial</sup> tensions with Russia sparked the Second Red Scare as it

(Section A continued) 1949, Russia developed their atomic bomb, much to the horror of the Americans. The terrifying backdrop of the Cold War <sup>acted as</sup> ~~provided~~ a magnifying glass to ~~the~~ internal suspicions. In ~~1946~~, a Canadian ~~1945~~, the Communist newspaper 'Amarama' was discovered leaking sensitive American information. Its origin was undoubtedly the US State Department therefore McCarthy exacerbated this fear of 'reds under the bed'. In 1946, a Canadian spy ring was discovered leaking nuclear secrets to Russia. A Jewish couple accused of being spies were executed in 1953. All these events fuelled internal suspicion and generated a legitimate threat of Communism in America. ~~Internal~~

In conclusion, it is evident that the Cold War and ~~its~~ internal suspicions were primarily responsible for the rise in anti-communist feelings in 1947 to 1954. Disloyalty in America coupled with the backdrop of events such as the Berlin Blockade and the <sup>worrying</sup> 'necessity' of the Truman Doctrine provoked the intense fear. However, the impact would not have been as great as it was without ~~the~~ McCarthy's cunning exacerbation of fears, ~~and~~ 'traditional intolerance' and <sup>and daunting</sup> a new 'post-war America'.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This low Level 5 response offers a well-focused analysis of the reasons for anti-communism in early post-war America. Good range and depth are evident. The arguments deployed are reinforced with supporting evidence throughout and the essay is rounded off with an informed judgement in the conclusion.



## Question 5

Most candidates who attempted this question were able to discuss South Carolina's decision to secede from the Union as a reason for war between the North and South and then weigh this stated factor against others, such as North-South economic differences and the divisive issue of slavery. Better responses integrated source material and candidates' own knowledge to develop an argument about the reason(s) for the Civil War based on the issues raised by the extracts. These responses cross-referenced the sources extensively to support or challenge particular viewpoints in the process of reaching a judgement. Weaker candidates often relied almost exclusively on the source material and introduced very little own knowledge to develop a line of argument. In addition, some low-scoring answers merely offered 'potted' summaries of each source, often with a little own knowledge included, which prevented cross-referencing and the development of a support/challenge approach.

The American Civil War had many causes, both long- and short-term. Source 1 argues that the primary cause was the secession of the Southern States, whereas Source 2 argues that the main cause was slavery. Source 3, on the other hand, argues that the economic differences between the North and the South and the North's desire to industrialise were the causes of the war.

Source 1 states that "Had South Carolina not moved so quickly, history might have taken a different turn", and that the other Southern States ~~to~~ were "emboldened by South Carolina's example". This clearly shows that if South Carolina had not seceded, then it is unlikely that the secession in other Southern States would have prevailed. This is clear from the fact that in Texas, the Governor, Sam Houston, insisted on holding a referendum to decide, rather

[Section B continued] then allowing the radicals in government to take control. This was despite of South Carolina's bold move, suggesting that had South Carolina not seceded, the other States in the Deep South may not have either. The view in Source 1 is backed up in Source 2, which states that "the South had concluded that his [Lincoln's] presidency threatened an end to the peculiar institution", and it suggests that, in the view of the South, the only way to protect slavery was to secede. Despite Lincoln's promise at his inauguration that he only wanted to stop the spread of slavery, Southerners pointed to his debates with Stephen Douglas in 1858 where Lincoln's views on slavery were more wide-ranging and harmful to the South. This suggests that the question of slavery was the primary cause of secession, but that Source 1's view - that South Carolina's decision to secede was the primary cause of war - is correct. As such, the sources go far in implying that the primary cause of ~~war~~<sup>war</sup> was South Carolina's decision to secede.

On the other hand, Source 3 agrees

(Section B continued) that the primary causes of war were the economic differences between the North and the South. Source 3 states that "the North hunted toward a future of industrial capitalism that many southerners found... frightening" and that the South "sought to preserve its version of the republic". It is clear that Source 3 believes that the primary cause of war was the inability of the North and the South to bring their views of the future of the American economy together. As the Southern economy was so heavily dependant on slavery - there were 4 million slaves in the South out of a total population of 9 million - the Southern economy could only survive "if slavery was extended into the territories" as stated in Source 2. The fact that only 10% of slaves were employed in industrial jobs and that the South had as many industrial workers as the North had factories - 118,000 - clearly shows that Source 3's view that the South was "acting to preserve traditional rights and values" of an agrarian society are correct. As such, the idea that the primary cause of the war

(Section B continued)

was the secession of South Carolina is invalid - the view presented in Sources 2 and 3 is that the primary cause of the war was the preservation of the Southern economy.\*

In conclusion, the view that the primary cause of the American Civil War was South Carolina's decision to secede from the Union is correct. While it is fair to say that there were many reasons for South Carolina's secession, such as slavery and economic differences, there wouldn't have been a war if the South hadn't seceded, and the South wouldn't have seceded if South Carolina hadn't led the way. Therefore the Sources go very far in suggesting that the primary cause of the war was South Carolina's secession, regardless of what the causes of secession itself were.

\* As such the sources do not go very far in suggesting that the primary cause of the war was South Carolina's decision to secede.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This Level 2 response has two major weaknesses. First, the candidate simply extracts points from the sources and then cross-references some of them in a basic support/challenge way. Second, there is only limited supporting evidence drawn from the candidate's own knowledge to reinforce these source-based points.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

When planning your answer, read through the sources carefully and list all the support and challenge points you can. This will help you to cross reference effectively in your essay.

## Question 6

On this question, the majority of responses were able to offer a reasoned explanation for the Confederacy's defeat in the Civil War based on the competing views set out in the three sources (Southern weaknesses on the battlefield, Confederate problems on the home front and Lincoln's skilled leadership). Most candidates could also draw on a sound knowledge of the key events and developments between 1861 and 1865 which helped to determine the outcome. Stronger candidates integrated cross-referenced source material with their own knowledge to put forward a substantiated judgement. Lower scoring responses typically adopted the 'potted' summary approach to the sources or else included little or no own knowledge. A few of the weaker candidates uncritically accepted the Southern weaknesses viewpoint and failed to consider properly the other arguments set out in the extracts.

All three sources indicate contrasting reasons for Confederacy defeat in Civil War. Source ~~one~~<sup>4</sup> directly highlights "Southerners themselves" as the underlying factor. Whilst source ~~two~~<sup>5</sup> and ~~three~~<sup>6</sup> indicate other factors such as Political and military leadership, among other factors. All of which will play a vital role to ensure a northern victory.

Taken at face value source 4 indicates that the Southern inability to pull together in a common war effort was the essential factor. Williams states that the economies, particularly in the war sector were evenly matched. Further stating that the South "never lost a battle due to lack of war material." Hugh Brogan completely contradicts this saying that Southern armies walked bare foot and cold at night." To say that "Confederacy defeat ignores these" industrial advantages in the north is an

(Section B continued) incredibly bold statement, completely undermined by source 5 who states that the north took "three quarters of ~~industrial~~ industrial capacity" away from the north. Furthermore the north had 93% of America's pig iron, essential for making fire arms. Source 4 states that inflation gave the north an advantage, corroborated in source 6 who states that the South's "economic system ripped apart." Although the north too did suffer an 80% inflation, all be it miniscule compared to the south. The South did not cause inflation by itself cotton accounted for over half of America's exports, but the increasingly tight northern blockade meant that Southern exports dropped by over  $\frac{3}{4}$  by 1864, furthermore Britain (South's main cotton buyer) was now getting cheaper cotton from Egypt and India.

All three sources mention "Southern ~~disturbance~~ dissolution behind the lines" as a factor. Source 6 indicates a ~~total~~ lack of "national morale." This argument is strengthened by source 4 who indicates 'two-thirds of soldiers were absent by

(Section B continued) 1864" However 100,000 volunteers at the start of war, followed by a further 400,000 does not indicate a lack of moral, furthermore a strong sense of unity is found in the letters from soldiers. They were defending their homes and their way of life, this would naturally generate a strong sense of morale. "Soldiers deserting" in the south, was not too dissimilar to the north, Source 5 explains how northerners "imposed martial law" this shows that something is clearly wrong in the north to have to impose it in the first place. Furthermore the New York draft riots show clear division amongst northerners as well as the south. High inflation and lack of economic strength explain why Southern moral dropped, clear unity is exemplified at the start of war in soldiers letters home but northern military strength depleted it

Source 5 directly links Lincoln as a main cause of Southern defeat. Source 5 explains how "unified his party and Cabinet." Although having had 7 ministers of war in the first year of the war leads us to doubt this. It took Lincoln almost three years to find a winning team in

(Section B continued) that of Grant and McClellan, which it could be argued was by pure luck. Source 4 indicates the "greater northern industry and population." If it was so great it was clearly not managed well. Indicated in source 5 how Lincoln wanted to attack the ~~military~~ <sup>enemy</sup> "head on." This tactic clearly failed in the first year of the war as the Confederacy won all head on battles, the Battle of Bull Run being a prime example. Although Lincoln had a great talent in pulling together the union and generating a reason for the war. This being something that southern leaders never quite did.

Mentioned in source 6 is the military leadership of the South. Their inability to win "victories at crucial times" provided a downfall. This is exemplified in the first year of the war, the South having won many battles were in a position to attack Washington but Lee held back. Although perhaps due to poor supply lines (South only had ~~35%~~ 35% of America's train track). Furthermore the South held over 3/4 of America's military colleges, so was in a good



(Section B continued) position from the start. The South "Having lost half of their military age due to death or injury" (Source 6) explains perhaps why there was ~~2/3~~ "2/3 of Soldiers absent" as mentioned in Source 4. Source 6 Criticizes Lee's Surrender at Appomattox, he is also criticized for neglecting the west, although his lack of military, supplies and weapons would explain why he was unable to defend it. It would also account for Source 4. It says they "never lost a battle for lack of war materials." This may be true but many of the Southern battles were centered around Virginia, where the Southern army was. The battles were lost in the west because of lack of men. Which implies it was northern economic and population that defeated the confederacy, not the confederacy itself.

There are a number of reasons explained through out the sources as to confederacy defeat, the confederacy itself among them. Lincoln was undoubtedly a good leader but took far too long to find his winning plan. During which time Southern generals, mentioned in source 6, did not capitalise on

(Section B continued) It. Southern moral dropped dramatically and so with it desertion grew, as explained in Source 4. Although not at the start, sheer number of volunteers and letters home indicate clear unity and morale. But great losses and lack of ~~poor~~ equipment such as led to surrender at Appomattox followed by "Total War" explain that any army would run out of morale. They didn't defeat themselves they were simply outnumbered.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Here, the candidate has produced a high Level 3 answer by taking some information from all three sources and attempting to integrate a moderate amount of own knowledge to develop the argument. There is scope to offer more of both, and to cross reference the sources in a more detailed and systematic way.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

During the planning stage, after you have identified the key issues raised by the sources, add your own knowledge to these points. That way you'll find it easier to integrate the two elements in the actual essay.

## Question 7

In this question, the sources were used effectively overall and appropriate own knowledge was included to develop the argument about the reasons for the economic downturn of 1929. Stronger responses offered a sustained analysis based on the cross-referencing of the extracts and the integration of source material and own knowledge. These answers reached an informed judgement about the relative importance of the flawed government policies argument when set against other viewpoints, such as international economic conditions during and after the First World War and the problems associated with underconsumption and overproduction. Low-scoring candidates tended to exhibit two main weaknesses: (1) relying on a descriptive essay which was inadequately linked to the sources provided; (2) poor or non-existent integration of source material and own knowledge. A minority of candidates did not pick up on the links between government policy and some of the other factors mentioned in the sources, such as underconsumption, which would have provided good cross-referencing opportunities.

The impact of US government policy during the boom years has been a subject of varying criticism and much discourse surrounds the effects it had. When enquiring whether the Depression was caused by "flawed Republican government policies during the 1920s" it can be argued that indeed, the policies contributed to the crash and subsequent depression however there was also complex interplay between international factors as well as the fact that the boom was not as widely felt as often suggested. Thus, there is much evidence to support the contention that the government policies during the 1920s somewhat caused and contributed to the Great Depression, yet the extent to which they were the leading factor is debatable.

The Republican policies of the 1920s not only embodied the idea that the boom would never end, but in part can be considered to have contributed to its end. ~~Some historians~~ ~~are of the view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ ~~widely~~ ~~felt~~ ~~as~~ ~~often~~ ~~suggested~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~extent~~ ~~to~~ ~~which~~ ~~they~~ ~~were~~ ~~the~~ ~~leading~~ ~~factor~~ ~~is~~ ~~debatable~~ ~~and~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~Republican~~ ~~policies~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~1920s~~ ~~not~~ ~~only~~ ~~embodied~~ ~~the~~ ~~idea~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~would~~ ~~never~~ ~~end~~, ~~but~~ ~~in~~ ~~part~~ ~~can~~ ~~be~~ ~~considered~~ ~~to~~ ~~have~~ ~~contributed~~ ~~to~~ ~~its~~ ~~end~~. ~~Some~~ ~~historians~~ ~~are~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~view~~ ~~that~~ ~~the~~ ~~boom~~ ~~was~~ ~~not~~ ~~as~~ <

(Section B continued) <sup>(1921-1923)</sup> Harding ~~and~~ and Calvin Coolidge (1923-1929) agreed that Republican and indeed any, government intervention should only ensue if absolutely necessary. This idea of self help was suggested to be a part of the American psyche by Turner in the late 19th century. The implications of the 'laissez-faire' approach adopted by both these Republican presidents contributed to the cause of the depression. ~~Both sources 7 and 8 agree that the 'tariffs' introduced had a negative long-term impact. Source 7 suggests that~~ ~~reductions led to overstimulation of the economy which helped contribute to a sharp downturn.~~ The introduction of tariffs such as the Fordney McCumber tariff during the early 1920s aimed to protect US goods from foreign competition and thus retain money in the US economy. Sources 7 and 8 demonstrate how this measure was damaging in the long term as not only did it 'discourage foreign trade' but it impacted the ~~the~~ international depression as Europeans were 'unable to sell goods in the American market because of high tariffs'. Indeed, what had been profitable in the short term had catastrophic long term consequences. ~~The~~ The tariffs of the 1920s built a culture of 'protectionism' and self interest as opposed to world interest which played a significant role during the depression as even 'free-trade' Great Britain introduced tariffs in 1931 in retaliation. ~~Source 8~~

In addition, the impact of Republican tax reductions also impacted the depression. Source 7 ~~and source 8~~ illustrates how the ~~Republican~~ 'tax reductions led to over-saving by the consuming public, which helped diminish consumer demand for goods' whilst source 9 depicts the 'cuts' impacting the 'disparity in income levels' which were 'aggravated' by tax cuts for the rich. ~~the addition to the~~ ~~the~~ government policy also led to 'monopolies' and 'high prices' due to the ~~lack of~~ 'weak enforcement of anti-trust laws' yet this demonstrates how it was government lack of acting which was harmful. Indeed source 7 refers to the 'passivity' of the government which ~~the~~ 'helped' to turn the recession into the depression. The 'laissez-faire' approach ~~paired~~ ~~paradoxically~~ & inaction paired paradoxically with the Republican intervention certainly fuelled the depression. \*However overall, these government policies did not ~~the~~ cause the depression and the general thrust of source 7 continuously affects the role ~~of~~ the policy played as contributory not solely responsible. This is evident in that the policies of 1920 'contributed' to the crisis and 'helped diminish consumer demand' as well as 'helped' turn the recession into depression. Therefore there is only a certain extent

(Section B continued) to which the 1920s Republican policies can be said to have caused the boom.

~~Another relevant factor was the international economy~~

\* The Republicans have been criticised for their refusal to curb the speculation hysteria of 1927-1929 which would have been possible due to the Federal Reserve Board's capacity to alter interest rates. Once again the 'passivity' referred to in source 7, can be seen as relevant with even source 4 referring to the 'stock speculation' as a problem and source 8 alluding to the hysteria in that 'American investors were keeping their money at home, investing in the lucrative US stock market'. This demonstrates the influence & impact of Republican action & inaction.

Another relevant factor was the international economy which source 8 claims 'contributed to the depression'. But source 8 can be considered to explain the impact of this factor in relation to the government policy aforementioned mostly. Firstly, the debt system established ~~after the war~~ after the war made the US a key ~~lender~~ lender, funding both 'Germany' with bank loans and 'France and Great Britain'. However the crash led to a new need to call in loans from both sides and this led the 'world economy to ground to

(Section B continued) a halt'. The relevance of government policy can be seen in that the maintaining of high tariffs established in the 1920s meant that when the French & British monetary value declined, we could not afford to sell goods in the US or buy from the US subsequently reducing consumer capacity. The British abandoned the gold standard in 1931 symbolic in that it further reduced the value of the pound and consumer capacity. ~~As source 7 mentions~~ As source 7 mentions 'speculation' the ~~international~~ international economy also suffered from the ~~withdrawal~~ American investors' withdrawing from international investment to focus on the 'lucrative US stock market' which was significant as it highlights the boom and actions of 1920s in effect had the seed to sow their own destruction. Overall, the international picture can be seen as again a 'contributory' factor, one which was partly in part by US policy but also expanded as a result of the initial recession and perpetuated the subsequent depression.

Lastly, the fact that during the 1920s there was a 'growing gap between the rich and poor' also contributed to the depression. The state of the labour force and in effect, the contention that the same was an inevitable result of the events

Section B continued)

that occurred during the 1920s. Source 9 cites 'maldistribution' as the 'main cause of the depression', which is significant in that it is the only source which states what factor was the most significant. Despite this, Republican policies can be seen to be relevant to this factor. The fact the Andrew Mellon 'tax cuts' referred to in both source 7 and 9, 'aggravated the gross disparity in income levels' evident in that the boom was not shared amongst workers with wages not rising quickly. This is important because with the working class limited in their income, there was no way they could participate in the boom at the same rate and 'consumer demand for goods was diminished' as a result of this Republican policy. In addition to this, the Republican approach had demonstrated 'hostility to ward unions and discouraged collective bargaining' because it opposed ideas of relief and negated individualism. Source 9 supports this by claiming there was an 'unfavourable climate for labour unions which made it difficult for workers'. ~~Source 9 also states that~~ the fact that 60% of Americans were under the poverty line ~~at~~ by the end of the 20s, demonstrates that the boom was not widely felt which corrob-



(Section B continued) creates the view in source 9.

Overall, the Depression must be considered to have been caused by a conglomeration of factors which undoubtedly includes 1920s republican policy. However, these in isolation did not cause the boom as the sources depict. The policies of republicans were a contributory factor, paired with the rotten agriculture industry of the 1920s and the crashing share values of 1929. Indeed, the policies also further perpetuated the depression in addition to the ~~large~~ international damage to the world economy. Overall a complex interplay of factors evident throughout the 1920s can be said to have caused the depression and thus to some extent, the depression can be said to be a result of 'republican policies' partially. But all three sources demonstrate that the limited nature of the boom, the international economy and the republican policies contributed, yet more weight is given to the policies as they also impacted the other factors. Therefore republican policies can be seen as highly significant but not the only relevant factor.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This Level 4 response integrates source material and the candidate's own knowledge to good effect. The key points in the sources are identified, examined and extended, with other supporting evidence, to develop the argument. The conclusion also makes a clear judgement about the relative importance of US government policies by stressing the interplay of the factors discussed.

## Question 8

This proved to be a popular question. Many candidates made good use of the sources and their own knowledge to develop a confident line of argument about the extent to which the US economy 'expanded strongly' due to the New Deal. The strongest candidates offered a sustained source-led analysis with impressive range and depth. Many in this category provided extensive cross-referencing of the sources to emphasise, for example, how the New Deal brought about only partial economic expansion which was given further momentum by the approach of war. Weaker candidates tended to produce: (1) a narrative of the main New Deal measures which was inadequately linked to the question; (2) a 'potted' source by source commentary with little or no cross-referencing which prevented the development of a support/challenge approach. Many candidates failed to recognise that 'optimistic' Source 10 did not consider the New Deal's record beyond 1937.

Banking + finance:	Industry:	
- Emergency Banking Relief Act	- NRA	
- Glass-Steagall Act 1933	- National labour relation Act	
- Economy Act	- Public Utilities	
- Truth in Securities	- Fair labor standards Act.	
- Revenue Act		
employment:	Agriculture:	RELIEF
CCC	- Farm credit Act	- FERA
CWA	- AAA / 2 <sup>nd</sup> AAA	- Social Security Act
NRA	- TVA	↳
BPNA	- Rural electrification	
	- bankhead joes	
	- Resettlement Administration	

---

Historians have debated ~~whether~~ whether or not the New Deal was responsible for the US economy expanding strongly in the years 1932-39. Source 1 argues the ND did expand economically due to reduced unemployment, increased industrial

**Section B continued)** production and a positive response from the stock market. On the other hand, sources 2 and 3 both suggest that the ND failed the US economy. Source 3 ~~primarily~~ primarily blamed the war for the expansion of the US economy. Overall, I agree with source 3 which suggests the ND did improve some economic issues, however, it was the presence of the war that increased the economy.

The sector of the ND which impacted the US economy was employment. Source 1 argues "The unemployment rate fell from over 22% in 1932 to 9% in 1937." Such improvements were due to ND measures such as the CCC <sup>(1933)</sup> which employed ~~over 250,000 in its first year followed by 500,000 by 1935,~~ ~~employment opportunities arose due to the CWA which employed men aged 17-24, similarly employment opportunities arose due to the CWA~~ <sup>(1933)</sup> which employed 2 million for the winter of 1933-1934, furthermore, the NPA ~~provided employment for 4 million people and by 1941 had the WPA (1935) employed over 20% of the workforce.~~ This is also evident as source 1 states there was an "increase ~~in~~ of 25% in the labour force." for example, the WPA ~~(1935)~~ <sup>(1935)</sup> provided employment for 4 million people, and by 1941 had employed 20% of the workforce. On the other hand source 2 argues "the

(Section B continued) New Deal prolonged high ~~employment~~ unemployment" for example, the CWA (1933) only provided employment for the winter of 1933-34, similarly, the CCC only ~~employment~~ employed men aged 17-24. The PWA was also limited as it only provided employment for skilled workers, consequently, by 1938 unemployment figures were at 19%. Source 3 supports this when it states "there remained 9.5 million unemployed despite such measures within the ND. In this way, the employment opportunities were limited and therefore prevented the economy from expanding to the fullest potential, it wasn't until 1945 as a result of the war that unemployment fell to 2% with 60% of women being employed.

Another sector of the ND which impacted the US economy was industry. Source 1 argues "the Federal Reserve's industrial production index more than doubled due to ND measures such as the Public Utilities Holding Company Act 1935 which broke up big holding companies, similarly, the fair labour standards Act 1935 provided fair wages for all companies involved in interstate trade, consequently by 1941, 300,000 people's wages had increased. On the other hand, source 2 ~~argues~~ reveals "FDR signed into law higher taxes for everybody" consequently "employers

**[Section B continued]** had less money with which to hire people" such problems occurred as a result of the NRA (1933) which aimed to improve working conditions + wages for employees, the measure provided 557 codes that companies had to comply with, however, many large businessmen such as Henry Ford refused to join, ~~and~~ and many of the companies that did join ~~as~~ exploited the codes by reducing their workforce + increasing prices, consequently, the NRA was ruled unconstitutional after the 1935 Sick Chicken case. As source 2 states "the high corporate taxes" meant many ~~f~~ small firms were disadvantaged as a result of measures such as the NRA, ~~the~~ the National Recovery Review Board 1937 recognised ~~this~~ the disadvantages small firms faced. In this way, the ND failed to provide any long term economic expansion as by 1941 the production of motor cars had decreased by 13%, ~~and~~

In addition to this, agriculture was limited in providing economic expansion ~~due~~ under the ND. Source 1 argues "during the ND the "economy expanded strongly" due to ~~of~~ agricultural measures such as the Farm Credit Act 1929 which provided loans to farmers so that they could keep their properties, similarly the TVA 1933 built 20 dams in order to provide electricity, as a result between 1929 and

(Section B continued) 1949 income rates increased by 300%.  
Source 1 On the other hand source 2 argues "that the "Americans had suffered a catastrophic contraction" much of which was due to the limitations of agricultural measures such as Resettlement Administration Act 1939 which planned to move 500,000 families from poor land to better land, similarly the AAA caused dramatic problems after the slaughtering of 6 million pigs, the waste food was not given to the unemployed, therefore causing public uproar. Similarly the second AAA 1938 planned to keep surplus products for years of bad harvest, however this proved to be too complicated. Source 3 In addition source 3 states "prosperity only returned" because of the war" for example by 1945, farm income had increased by \$2,063. In this way the ND's agricultural measures had a limited impact on the economy in terms of prosperity as much of the change implemented provided little economic benefits.

Furthermore, the ND's changes to Banking and finance displayed limitations in providing economic prosperity. Source 3 states "Some New Deal policies did more harm than good" for example, the Revenue Act 1939, increased taxes on incomes over 50,000, however the impact of this was limited

(Section B continued) as only 1% of the population earned over 10,000. On the other hand source 1 states the "economy expanded strongly" due to changes such as the Glass-Steagall Act 1933, which ensured bank deposits of up to \$2,500, the aim of this act was to try and restore confidence in the American economy peoples view of the banking + finance industry, this combined with Roosevelt's 'fire and brimstone' speech which encouraged people to put their money back into the bank after the Emergency Banking Relief Act 1933 closed the banks for 6 days, consequently by April 1933, \$1 billion had been returned to the banks. In this way, the ND's attempts to improve banking + finance highlight the limitations of the ND in providing economic prosperity.

Overall, the ND's measures were limited in providing long term economic expansion, however, as source 1 states "unemployment rate fell" which suggests the ND prevented the depression getting worse. The main reason for the economy expanding strongly, was "because of the war" as source 3 states, WW2 provided an increase in jobs and production which increased spending and stimulated the American economy.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This low Level 5 response possesses several strengths. The candidate integrates the source material with decent own knowledge, to assess the 'expanded strongly' claim. Key economic areas (employment, industry, agriculture and banking/finance) are analysed and a brief evaluation is given at the end of each section. The answer is then rounded off with a clear judgement in the conclusion.

## Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

### In-Depth Study question

- Candidates must provide more factual details.
- Candidates need to ensure their subject knowledge conforms to the specification. Weaker responses usually lacked range and/or depth of analysis.
- Stay within the specific boundaries of the question – for example, some candidates explored issues outside of the relevant time periods.
- Candidates would benefit from planning their answers more effectively.
- Candidates need to offer an analysis not provide a descriptive or chronological account. However, many candidates produced answers which were focused and developed appropriately.
- Some candidates need to analyse key phrases and concepts more carefully.
- Some candidates could have explored links and the interaction between issues more effectively.

### Associated Historical Controversy question

- It is suggested that the students who perform best on Section B tended to be those who read the sources carefully, accurately and critically; recognised themes and issues arising from the sources, then used these to address the question.
- Some candidates potentially limited themselves by closing off potential areas of enquiry by seeking to make the evidence of the sources fit the contention in the question without full thought to the issues within the sources, or by using the sources to illustrate arguments without relating evidence to other sources or own knowledge.
- Candidates need to treat the sources as a package to facilitate cross-referencing and advance a convincing line of argument. Many weaker candidates resorted to 'potted' summaries of each source which failed to develop a support/challenge approach.
- Candidates need to integrate the source material and their own knowledge more effectively to substantiate a particular view. Weaker responses were frequently too reliant on the sources provided and little, or no, own knowledge was included.
- Candidates should avoid memorised 'perspectives' essays and base their responses on the issues raised by the sources instead. The Associated Historical Controversy question is an exercise in interpretation not historiography.
- That said, there were very few really weak responses. The impression was that the substance of the source at least enabled candidates offer some development and supporting evidence. In such cases though, candidates often struggled to extend issues with own knowledge, or really analyse the given views.
- There was also a correlation between those candidates who reviewed all sources in their opening paragraph and high performance. Whilst a telling introduction is not essential, the process of carefully studying the sources to ascertain how they relate to the statement in the question prior to writing the main analysis, allows candidates to clarify and structure their arguments.



## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE