



Cambridge International Examinations
Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education

AMERICAN HISTORY

0409/02

Paper 2 Defining Moments

For Examination from 2015

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 30 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 45

This document consists of **10** printed pages.

Notes

- The full mark range will be used as a matter of course. Marking must be positive. Marks must not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant material. Half-marks will not be used.
- Levels of response criteria are used for questions where a hierarchy of answers is possible. Each answer is to be placed in the level that best reflects its qualities. It is not necessary to work through the levels.
- In all levels, provisionally award the highest mark and then moderate according to the qualities of the individual answer.
- Arguments need to be supported with evidence. Lots of facts/dates are not required.
- No set answer is looked for to any question. The examples given in the mark scheme are indicative only and are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive. They are given only as examples of some responses/approaches that may be seen by an examiner.
- This is a source-based paper. Responses that make no reference to the content of the source(s) can be awarded Level 2 at most.

Section A: Slavery before 1863

1 Study Source A.

What do you learn from this source about the trade in slaves within the Southern states? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to the source and/or question. [1–2]

- Slaves were sold when they were no longer needed.

Level 2: Description only: identifies details. [3–4]

- Slaves sold for different reasons (“ingratitude”, redundant: death of wife, cost).
- Mothers separated from children (Eliza from Jennie) and its emotional effects (letter was clearly in response to a plea from Eliza for Jennie to join her.)
- Commercial priorities paramount (Eliza sold for money, Jennie not sold as she was “useful”, Eliza sold on again).
- Arbitrariness of trade (Eliza moved from Maryland to Louisiana).

Level 3: Level 2 with knowledge. [5–6]

- Slaves were an investment/property to be utilized fully so were bought and sold for commercial gain.
- Scale of interstate slave trade considerable (ca.25,000 slaves moved each year within the U.S. 1830–60).
- Movement from border states like Maryland to the Deep South (like Louisiana) and further West was increasing as new lands were opened.

2 Study Source B.

How informative is this poster about the reactions runaway slaves faced from others when on the run? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to source. [1]

- People tried to capture the slaves who had run away.

Level 2: Description only: identifies useful information. [2–3]

- Reactions of police and civil authorities who were prepared to uphold the law (“kidnappers” and “slave catchers” indicate hostility to fugitives).
- Reactions of friends of fugitive slaves prepared to help them evade the law (“cautioned” to “keep a sharp lookout”).

Level 3: Level 2 and addresses “How informative ...?” with knowledge or evaluation. [4–5]

Evaluation

- Context of Fugitive Slave Law (1850) explains timing of interest in fugitives and how they were to be treated.

- Mild tone of poster, with emphasis on the fugitives looking out for themselves, suggests limited commitment by others to help.

Knowledge

- The “underground railroad”.
- Reference to famous court cases on fugitive slaves.
- Personal Liberty Laws in some States confirm some authorities opposed the Fugitive Slave Law.
- Racism/Indifference to slavery was widespread in the North.

Level 4: Level 2 and addresses “How informative ...?” with knowledge and evaluation.

[6–7]

3 Study Source C.

How typical of the work of slaves on the land in the South are the activities shown in the photograph? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to source.

[1]

- The source is a real source showing slaves working on plantations.

Level 2: Description only: identifies aspects of the work of slaves.

[2–3]

- Labor was physical.
- Tasks were menial.
- Work was by hand, not machinery.
- Worked together doing similar jobs.
- Most worked on cotton plantations.
- No indication of supervision and discipline of the overseer.

Level 3: Level 2 and either knowledge or evaluation.

[4–5]

Evaluation

- Stock, though valid, comments about the photograph as a “snapshot” of work.
- Variations in size of farms/plantations considerable so picture could be regarded as typical of small-scale operation on a farm rather than a large-scale plantation.
- Overall impression of “contented slave” consistent with bias of those who regarded slavery as benign and slaves as “happy/inferior”.

Knowledge

- Nature of daily/seasonal cycle of work.
- Comments about climate, quality of soil.
- Details about supervision/discipline.
- Most worked with cotton rather than food crops.

Level 4: As Level 3 and addresses ‘typicality’ with knowledge and evaluation

[6–7]

4 Study Sources D and E.

Is one source more reliable than the other in its views on how slaves were treated? Explain your answer using details from the sources and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment about the sources. [1–2]

- Source D gives a more realistic view of the life of a slave than Source E.

Level 2: Answer based on description of the sources. [3–4]

Source D:

- Slaves wanted to be free (those who 'say slaves be quite happy – that man is ignorant').
- Slaves were made to work all the time ('work, work, work, night and day').
- Slaves were not allowed to complain ('we must not speak up').

Source E:

- Masters cared for their slaves ('the master's whole life is spent in providing for the smallest needs of others').
- Slaves respected their masters ('we rarely saw a slave who was devoted to his master').
- Mutual respect characterized relations between masters and slaves ('the ready submission of the slave cools his master's anger').

Level 3: As Level 2 and supported with own knowledge. [5–6]

Knowledge based on D

- Desire to be free supported by number of fugitives, the Fugitive Slave Law, and slave revolts.
- Continuous work supported by knowledge of working day.
- Abuse of slaves supported by details about racist attitudes and physical abuse of slaves.

Knowledge on E

- Desire to be free supported by number of fugitives, the Fugitive Slave Law, and slave revolts.
- Continuous work supported by knowledge of working day.
- Abuse of slaves supported by details about racist attitudes and physical abuse of slaves.
- Details about provisions made for slaves (sustenance, housing, medicine, etc.)
- Paternalism as typical of social attitudes could be discussed.

Level 4: Addresses question with evaluation. [7–8]

Evaluation on D

- Written by a slave who had gained her freedom: a personal account (how representative?).
- Provides weighted account ignoring variations in system between regions, masters, etc.
- Some accounts were deliberately exaggerated or even made up.

Evaluation on E

- Written by slaveholders with a vested interest in presenting slavery as good for the welfare of slaves, yet
- hints that slaves not happy (relations between masters and slaves not always cooperative).

Level 5: Reaches a conclusion. [9–10]

- Addresses reliability.
- Sustained and balanced with knowledge and evaluation of the sources.

5 Study Sources F and G.

How adequate are these sources as evidence for the debate about the effectiveness of slave labor? Use the two sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General assertion. [1–3]

- The sources are useful because they are both about how lazy slaves can be.

Level 2: One-sided answer OR a balanced answer that uses only own knowledge. [4–7]

Disagreement

Sources suggest slavery ineffective.

Content: evidence that slavery was ineffective.

Source F – slave labor was inefficient (“brute force”, slow).
slaves lacked incentive with no care “whether his labor is productive or not”.

Source G – slaves working as individuals were less effective than groups.
recognizes (“indolence and unskillfulness”) “laziness and lack of skill” of slaves.

Agreement

Sources indicate that slavery was effective.

Source F – slave owners consider slaves did “as well as might be expected”.
slavery provided for the needs of slaves.

Source G – slavery was “productive”/“more useful than other labor” (free labor).
development of the South due to slavery/food and clothes for people.

Level 3: A balanced answer using information from the sources and own knowledge.[8–11]

Knowledge

- success of Southern agriculture (especially “King Cotton”).
- wealth of some planters.
- slaves used in railroads, industry, etc.
- expansion of slavery West (Texas, Kansas)/export trade.
- degradation of the land by over-cropping.
- lack of industry in the South.
- need to apply strong discipline to work slaves.
- problem of runaways/resistance.

Level 4: A balanced answer with evaluation of the sources. [12–15]

Evaluation

Source F – a Northern perspective from a businessman with experience of free labor, yet frequent traveler in Virginia so some insight into slavery as a labor system.

Source G – a Southern perspective and the views of a leading spokesperson for slavery, so view likely to be more one-sided yet accepts slavery was imperfect.

Section B: The U.S.A. in the Cold War before 1963

6 Study Source H.

What does this cartoon tell you about American views of the Soviet Union at the end of World War Two? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to the source. [1–2]

- The Soviet Union was aggressive.

Level 2: Description only: identifies views. [3–4]

- Soviet Union was powerful (size of bear).
- Soviet Union was expansionist (bear grasping the globe).
- Soviet Union was rapacious/impatient (tongue, mouth dribbling).

Level 3: Level 2 with knowledge. [5–6]

- American views consistent with fear of communism dating back to 1917.
- Soviet Union occupied most of Central/Eastern Europe.
- Experience of disagreement with U.S.S.R. at Yalta and Potsdam.
- In general, the U.S. did not trust the U.S.S.R.

7 Study Source I.

“The U.S.A. airlifted supplies to Berlin from 1948 to 1949 because it was in U.S. interests to do so.” Explain whether you agree or disagree with this statement using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to the source. [1]

- I agree because it is the American President talking in the source.

Level 2: Either, agrees by description only. [2–3]

- The blockade threatened U.S. plans for Western Germany.
- To stop U.S.S.R. plans to score a major victory.

Or, disagrees by description only.

- The West Germans wanted the U.S./its allies to stay in Berlin.
- To prevent slow-down of European recovery.
- To prevent the starvation of Berliners.

Level 3: Level 2 and either knowledge or evaluation.**[4–5]**

Knowledge

- Airlift set in context of Cold War and the significance of holding Berlin in terms of the struggle between both sides.
- Broader concerns in the West about Russian threat to democracy and freedom (occupation of Central/Eastern Europe and ambitions to export communism) to explain reference to U.S. plans for Western Germany.
- Problems of European economy (unemployment, wrecked infrastructure) to explain need for recovery.
- The A-bomb to explain why Russia would not risk war.

Evaluation

- Reliable as Truman covers both selfish and unselfish motives.
- Possibly unreliable given the nature of some memoirs and the blandness of recollections.
- Awareness that most points made, even if U.S. acting for apparently unselfish motives, could be seen as to the advantage of the U.S.: matter of judgment.

Level 4: Level 2 and with knowledge and evaluation.**[6–7]****8 Study Source J.**

How completely does the photograph illustrate the nature of the military conflict in the Korean War (1950–53)? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to the source.

[1]

- It shows fighting took place in the mountains.

Level 2: Description only: identifies details.

[2–3]

- Fighting was in the mountains (reference to the terrain).
- Fighting was guerrilla warfare (numbers on both sides were small).
- Soldiers endured extreme hardship (exposed to elements, clothing).
- U.N. had the upper-hand (they have captured the Chinese).

Level 3: Level 2 and addresses “How completely ...?” with either knowledge or evaluation.

[4–5]

Knowledge

- The U.N. advance across the 38th Parallel from mid-October and the intervention of the Chinese as U.N. forces approached the Yalu River could be used to explain the content of the photograph. Similarly, knowledge that U.S. forces comprised the bulk of the U.N. force could be made clear.
- Knowledge about specific military events, such as the earlier squeeze on Pusan and the landings at Inchon, and the subsequent deadlock on the 38th Parallel, could be mentioned to demonstrate the limitations of the photograph.

Evaluation

- It does not provide information about fighting in the South where larger armies were deployed.

- The photograph gives no hint of the naval or air war that was also conducted.
- The impression that the U.N. had upperhand is misleading as fortunes fluctuated.

N.B. Candidates are likely to evaluate the source with knowledge, and if the answer is integrated in this way then marks from 4 to 7 will be allocated according to the extent of the assessment.

Level 4: Level 2 and addresses “How completely ...?” with knowledge and evaluation.

[6–7]

9 Study Source K and L.

Why do these sources differ in their assessment of how President Kennedy handled the Cuban Missile Crisis of October 1962? Explain your answer using details from the sources and your knowledge.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General comments about the sources.

[1–2]

- One source says the U.S.A. was superior to the U.S.S.R.
- The other source says the Russians might have fooled us.

Level 2: Offers reasons why the sources differ based on EITHER context OR provenance.

[3–4]

Context:

- They are different because Source K says the U.S.A. was far more militarily powerful than the U.S.S.R. whereas Source L implies that the Russians were also powerful.
- The U.S.A. had missile sites in Turkey and Italy so were more powerful.

Provenance:

- The writer of Source K was a Cuban exile who would have been unhappy with Kennedy for not taking a tougher line with the Russians.
- Source L was written shortly after Kennedy had been assassinated at a time when journalists were re-assessing his reputation.

Level 3: Offers reasons why the sources differ based on context AND provenance.

[5–6]

As Level 2, using both context **and** provenance.

Level 4: Answers based on evaluation of the provenance and context of the sources. [7–8]

- They are different because Source L says that Kennedy was fortunate that the Russians backed down, whereas Source K says that the U.S.A.’s victory was never in doubt. However, Source K was written by a Cuban exile who is likely to favour strong action against the Russians, therefore he may have exaggerated the U.S.A.’s military superiority. Source L may present a more balanced view of military strength, however, because the author was writing shortly after Kennedy’s assassination and was re-evaluating his legacy, he is more concerned with the precedent set than the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis itself.

Level 5: Reaches a conclusion based on sustained evaluation of the provenance and context of the sources.

[9–10]

10 Study Sources M and N.

To what extent was the defense of freedom the aim of American foreign policy before 1963? Use the two sources and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Level 0: No evidence submitted or response does not address the question.

Level 1: General assertion.

[1–3]

- Both sources are about foreign policy.

Level 2: One-sided answer OR a balanced answer that uses only own knowledge.

[4–7]

Content: evidence that foreign policy aimed to defend freedom.

M – refers to the importance of (“freedom” and) “free institutions”.

N – the defense of “liberty” is worth “any price”, etc.

Content: evidence that foreign policy had other aims.

M – peace and stability is stressed: references to an “assured peace”, “political stability”, and “against ... chaos” might be made. Also, the humanitarian concerns of U.S.A. are outlined but with an indication that the economic interests of the U.S. would be served in addressing these issues.

N – peace emphasized: references to “quest for peace”, “control of arms”.

Level 3: A balanced answer using information from the sources and own knowledge.[8–11]

Knowledge

M – insecurity and “political danger” in Europe after 1945, and even if “policy not directed against any country or doctrine” with the Soviets attempting to impose themselves in Central/Eastern Europe, the implication is that communism was a threat.

N – context of consolidation of communism in Central/Eastern Europe (tensions in Berlin) and Asia (Korea).

The arms race since 1945 and the dangers of proliferation. the threat of nuclear war.

Level 4: A balanced answer with evaluation of the sources.

[12–15]

Evaluation

M – address to an academic audience and, more widely, the U.S. public, so a need to present a convincing case, highlighting the selflessness of the U.S.A. but also the need to assure the U.S.S.R. that the Plan was not a threat to them.

N – idealism typical of an inaugural speech, and aware of his responsibility as leader of the “free world”, and global desire to deal with the nuclear danger.