

CAMBRIDGE INTERNATIONAL EXAMINATIONS
International General Certificate of Secondary Education

MARK SCHEME for the May/June 2013 series

0409 AMERICAN HISTORY (US)

0409/02

Paper 2 (Defining Moments), maximum raw mark 45

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2013 series for most IGCSE, GCE Advanced Level and Advanced Subsidiary Level components and some Ordinary Level components.

Page 2	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

Section A: The American Civil War, 1861- 1865

1 Study Source A

What is the message of this cartoon? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

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

- Fighting was hard.

Level 2: Identifies message [3–5]

- The war between the North and South was totally destructive in every way (refers to some of the points in Alternative Level 2).

Alternative Level 2: Description only: identifies points. [3–5]

- War threatened the Union (branch near breaking point).
- North was defending the Union (holds branch labelled 'The Union').
- War was financially ruinous ('BANKRUPTCY' in a bottomless pit).
- Fighting was hard (hand to hand, high casualties).

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

- Confederate states had broken away (secession since December 1860).
- U.S. debts were huge (\$100 million by 1862).
- Human cost was high (over 600,000 deaths, 400,000 wounded).

Page 3	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

2 Study Source B

How far does this account support the view that the blockade of the South was effective? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

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

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

- The ship lost its cargo (150 barrels of gunpowder ‘were thrown overboard’).
- Northern ships blocked ports (12 in this case, off one port).
- Yet Cornubia reached port and managed to leave again.

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

Evaluation:

- Danger (‘Yankees bearing down on us’ and ‘shot falling close’) was realistic enough, even if the sense of excitement and thrill of the chase conveyed might exaggerate the drama of the situation.
- Only one ship suggests there was limited scope for the Confederates to run the blockade and the account admits her cargo was lost so blockade was effective.
- This was only one episode involving one ship so it may be an exception.

Knowledge:

- Most of the U.S. Navy was in Northern hands: the outcome of naval battles like Hampton Roads were, largely, successes for the North.
- Blockade was effective in damaging Southern economy (cotton exports hit).
- Blockade was effective in checking the supplies of munitions, etc. (confirmed in the source itself) which helps explain the shortages of munitions in the South.
- Yet, the coastline was too long to check all ships so unsurprising that some ships breached the blockade, as the Cornubia did on this occasion.

Level 4: Level 2 **and** addresses ‘how far’ with knowledge **and** evaluation. [6–7]

Page 4	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

3 Study Source C

How useful is this drawing in portraying the reality of battles fought during the Civil War? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

Level 1: General comment: loose reference to source and/or question [1]

- It shows fighting was intense.

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

- Large numbers of men were involved (men across a wide area).
- Armies advanced in formation (regular lines).
- Close hand-to-hand fighting (bayonets can be identified).
- Terrain/weather could be difficult (trees/snow).
- Brutality of fighting (dead bodies in foreground).
- Sharp shooters deployed (men in foreground).

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

Evaluation:

- Does the drawing evoke the horror and fear of war or not? (men running, sense of danger or are such realities made bland?)
- Does the drawing illustrate the courage of soldiers? (men charging, others defending their cause or is it obscured?)
- Does the drawing convey the scale, chaos and losses of fighting? (lots of men, few casualties evident, are the lines too organised?)
- Does the drawing illustrate the battle tactics of the day? (attack against well defended positions, represented here by the long ‘wall’ of Confederate forces on the high ground.)
- Does the drawing accurately show the weapons used? (rifles and bayonets only.)

Knowledge:

- Battles involving large numbers of men (examples might be provided).
- Details of casualty rates (numbers of dead and wounded).
- Trench systems/nature of defences especially in the Eastern theatre (Richmond).
- Close quarter of much fighting (Sharpsburg, Gettysburg, etc.).
- Weapons (Gatling gun, artillery).

Level 4: Level 2 and addresses ‘how useful’ with knowledge **and** evaluation. [6–7]

Page 5	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

4 Study Sources D and E

Is it fair to accuse Sherman of cruelty in his campaign in the South? Explain your answer using details from the sources and your knowledge.

Level 1: General comment: offers reasons with only loose links to the sources. [1–2]

Level 2: Explanation based on content **or** knowledge **or** evaluation only. [3–4]

Content only:

- D argues that Sherman’s orders were cruel because:
 - People who had already evacuated Atlanta were suffering (the country was crowded, people were staying in churches, etc.).
 - Women and children were in peril, especially in winter.
 - Civilians were innocent victims.
- E argues that Sherman was not cruel because:
 - He ordered attacks only on anything that was useful to the enemy.
 - General Wade Hampton (Confederate) fired cotton in the streets.
 - His men tried to douse the fires in Columbia.

Evaluation only:

- D = as a plaintive asking for clemency, the situation is likely to have been exaggerated to impress Sherman more by appealing to his humanity.
- E = unsurprising that Sherman would defend himself, not least because he is writing to his superiors in a report that might later be used as evidence.

Knowledge on D:

- provides details about the nature of Sherman’s burning of Atlanta, November 1864, his ‘March to the Sea’ and his march through the Carolinas.
- Sherman’s attitudes to the South.
- Some information about the scale of suffering in the South (could refer to ‘Gone with the Wind’).

Knowledge on E:

- Knowledge about Sherman’s attitude/intentions could be used to show the disingenuousness of his claims.
- Union damage directed against property not people.
- Confederate tactics could be considered, e.g. Hood’s attempts to disrupt Sherman’s lines of communication with attacks to the Union rear.
- Responsibility for the burning of Columbia remains controversial.

Level 3: Offers reason(s) based on content **and** knowledge or evaluation. [5–7]

Level 4: Offers reasons based on content **and** knowledge and evaluation. [8–10]

Page 6	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

5 Study Source F

‘The Battle of Gettysburg was the most important military event in the Civil War.’ How far do you agree with this view? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Level 1: General assertion rather than explanation. [1–2]

Level 2: **One-sided** answer: **either** agrees **or** disagrees. [3–8]

Agreement:

- An ‘auspicious’ moment, ‘there will be no brighter page’
- The Union was defended.
- ‘Martyr-heroes’

Knowledge:

- Battle bled the South.
- Gettysburg checked threat to North.

Disagreement:

- Other achievements of the war on land and sea are recognised.

Knowledge:

- Comments on battles such as Antietam, Vicksburg and their significance
- War continued for another two years so importance of Gettysburg may be questioned.

Evaluation:

- The context of a commemoration might explain the colour of the speech.
- The fact that Everett was a noted orator might explain the soaring eloquence of his peroration.
- His speech may be seen as fitting given the importance of Gettysburg, if only for its scale if not for its significance.
- Sense of history may explain the tenor of the speech.
- Speech was made in 1863, before the end of the war, so judgement about the importance of Gettysburg based on the war to that point only.

Level 3: **Two-sided** answer: agreement **and** disagreement but **imbalanced**. [9–11]

Level 4: **Two-sided** answer: agreement **and** disagreement and **balanced**. [12–14]

NB At Levels 3 or 4:

- If knowledge only: mark at the lower end of the Level.
- If only evaluation: mark in the middle of the Level.
- If knowledge and evaluation: mark at the top end of the Level.
- If a judgement is provided at Levels 3 or 4 an additional mark may be awarded.

Page 7	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

Section B: America in Vietnam

6 Study Source A

What does this poster tell you about Vietcong tactics? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

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

- The Vietcong fought in the jungles.

Level 2: Description only: identifies details. [3–5]

- Vietcong used jungle to hide their positions (individuals in different places).
- Vietcong lured U.S. soldiers into open space (trucks off-load into clearing).
- Surprise important (shown by nervous expectation of U.S. troops of attack).

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

- Vietcong avoided battles in the open.
- Vietcong relied on guerrilla warfare (small scale, irregular attacks).
- Use of booby traps, system of tunnels, Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Page 8	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

7 Study Source B

How useful is this source as evidence for the effectiveness of American bombing raids? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

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

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

- Physical impact widespread (image of a land of craters).
- Psychological impact huge (disturbance to senses/bodily functions, terror).
- People were killed (guerrillas ‘suddenly swallowed up’).

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

Evaluation:

- Reliable as an extract from a Vietcong fighter who experienced B-52 raids and who concedes the effects were as if ‘caught in the Apocalypse’).
- Impression that effect was limited in terms of casualties might be assessed as an underestimate from an enemy of the U.S. or possibly accurate given the elusiveness of the Vietcong.
- Written 10 years after the end of the war, it might be argued that the account is accurate given the victory of the Vietcong.

Knowledge:

- Details about the extent of U.S. bombing (in terms of bombs dropped, time scale of bombing, devastation of Hanoi, etc.).
- Details about Vietcong methods to divert U.S. bombing to ‘harmless targets’.
- Use of napalm and defoliants.
- Bombing did not stop Viet Cong/victory of North Vietnam.

Alternative Level 3: content is used to present an argument for and against. [4–5]

Level 4: Level 2 **and** addresses how useful with knowledge **and** evaluation. [6–7]

Page 9	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

8 Study Source C

Why was the President’s adviser so pessimistic about the position in Vietnam? Explain your answer using details from the source and your knowledge.

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

- The war was not going well.

Level 2: Description only: identifies reasons. [2–3]

- Unable to do the job in the time available (‘summer’ deadline).
- Public opinion was a problem (‘Time is limited by reactions in America’).
- Military victory impossible (North Vietnamese cannot be kept off the South Vietnamese and the former can ‘slip around them’).

Level 3: Level 2 **and** assesses ‘so pessimistic’ **either** with knowledge **or** evaluation. [4–5]

Evaluation:

- The views expressed represent those of one man only, though Acheson was the most respected voice and most prominent of the ‘wise men’.
- The assessment is frank about the limitations of U.S. power and the political context.
- The Tet Offensive effectively confirmed the points made in the report about the North Vietnamese being able to ‘slip around them’.

Knowledge:

- Details about the anti-war movement might be provided to explain the reference to ‘reactions in America’.
- Acheson was not the only dissenting voice (George Ball may be known to candidates, but even McGeorge Bundy had doubts at this stage).
- Details about the Tet Offensive would be useful (its scale and the dent it made in U.S. confidence).
- Walter Cronkite’s reports on the Tet Offensive could be mentioned to explain the link between the two points above.
- An assessment of the military situation in March 1968 after 4 years of engagement might be made.

Level 4: Level 2 **and** assesses ‘so pessimistic’ with knowledge **and** evaluation. [6–7]

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

Page 10	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

9 Study Sources D and E

To what extent can the account of the soldier in Source D help you to understand the action of the soldier in Source E? Explain your answer using details from the sources and your knowledge.

Level 1: General comment: offers reasons with only loose links to the sources. [1–2]

Level 2: Offers an explanation based on content **or** knowledge **or** evaluation only. [3–4]

Understandable:

- U.S. soldiers regarded ‘anybody ... enemy’ and despite ‘trying to work with these people’ they were ‘shot at by a sniper’ and the people were unco-operative so ‘You didn’t trust them’.
So, Source E is understandable as an act of revenge or simple survival/self-preservation (dependent on how student interprets source).

Not understandable:

- U.S. was ‘trying to work with these people’ and provided ‘medical treatment’ for example (Source D).
So the burning of villages (Source E) was likely to be counter-productive.

Evaluation only:

- D: may be considered typical of the troops’ attitude or not.
- E: may be considered acceptable in the context or regarded as an atrocity (scope to cross refer to other atrocities, e.g. My Lai, also in 1968).

Knowledge:

- U.S. policy of ‘search and destroy’ meant clearing villages and burning them down after removing the villagers to ‘safety’, so Source E is understandable as consistent with this policy.
- U.S. policy of winning ‘hearts and minds’, so Source E is not understandable.
- Reference could be made to other U.S. tactics, e.g. bombing, so Source E might be considered understandable (if bombing was considered ineffective) or not understandable (if bombing was considered effective).

Level 3: Offers reasons based on content **and** knowledge or evaluation. [5–7]

Level 4: Offers reasons based on content **and** knowledge and evaluation. [8–10]

Page 11	Mark Scheme	Syllabus	Paper
	IGCSE – May/June 2013	0409	02

10 Study Sources F

How convincing is this account of the reasons for atrocities committed by U.S. soldiers in the Vietnam War? Use the source and your knowledge to explain your answer.

Level 1: General assertion rather than explanation. [1–2]

Level 2: **One-sided** answer: **either** convincing **or** unconvincing. [3–8]

Convincing: candidates will vary in their views about the analysis.

- Brutality of war emphasised ('Communists were ruthless') convincing?
- Concept of revenge ('acts of retribution for friends') convincing?
- Instinct for survival ('overpowering greed for survival') convincing?

Knowledge:

- Many U.S. soldiers were reluctant conscripts.
- Use of drugs.
- My Lai.

Unconvincing: candidates will vary in their views about the analysis.

- Effect of climate ('terrible conditions') unconvincing?
- Stress ('trivial provocation could make men explode') unconvincing?
- The mission ('simply to kill').
- A response to Communist atrocities ('as common ... as shell craters'), etc.

Knowledge:

- Not all soldiers who faced similar conditions committed atrocities.
- Soldiers were under orders from officers.

Evaluation:

- Claims that atrocity stories have been exaggerated might be assessed.
- Accepts that U.S. soldiers were fallible ('possessed ... both good and bad qualities').
- Author served in Vietnam so he may want to defend his fellow soldiers.
- Author was writing after the war when U.S. forces were under close scrutiny which was largely hostile.
- Author served in early stages of war, arguably before atrocities became so notorious so his analysis, it might be argued, was based on limited experience/a different phase of the war.

Level 3: **Two-sided** answer: convincing **and** unconvincing but **imbalanced**. [9–11]

Level 4: **Two-sided** answer: convincing **and** unconvincing and **balanced**. [12–14]

NB At Levels 3 or 4:

- If knowledge only: mark at the lower end of the Level.
- If only evaluation: mark in the middle of the Level.
- If knowledge and evaluation: mark at the top end of the Level.
- If a judgement is provided at Levels 3 or 4 an additional mark may be awarded.