



General Certificate of Education

History 5041/6041

Alternative L The United States, 1877–1991

Mark Scheme

2006 examination – June series

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of candidates' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS and A2 EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners

A: INTRODUCTION

The AQA's AS/A2 History specification has been designed to be 'objectives-led' in that questions are set which address the assessment objectives published in the Board's specification. These cover the normal range of skills, knowledge and understanding which have been addressed by AS and A2 level candidates for a number of years.

Most questions will address more than one objective reflecting the fact that, at AS/A2 level, high-level historical skills, including knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together.

The specification has addressed subject content through the identification of 'key questions' which focus on important historical issues. These 'key questions' give emphasis to the view that GCE History is concerned with the analysis of historical problems and issues, the study of which encourages candidates to make judgements grounded in evidence and information.

The schemes of marking for the specification reflect these underlying principles. The mark scheme which follows is of the 'levels of response' type showing that candidates are expected to demonstrate their mastery of historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

Consistency of marking is of the essence in all public examinations. This factor is particularly important in a subject like History which offers a wide choice of subject content options or alternatives within the specification for AS and A2.

It is therefore of vital importance that assistant examiners apply the marking scheme as directed by the Principal Examiner in order to facilitate comparability with the marking of other alternatives.

Before scrutinising and applying the detail of the specific mark scheme which follows, assistant examiners are required to familiarise themselves with the instructions and guidance on the general principles to apply in determining into which level of response an answer should fall (Section B for AS and Section C for A2) and in deciding on a mark within a particular level of response (Section D).

B: EXEMPLIFICATION OF AS LEVEL DESCRIPTORS

Level 1:

The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/Guidance

Answers at this level will

- be excessively generalised and indiscriminating with little reference to the focus of the question
- lack specific factual information relevant to the issues
- lack awareness of the specific context
- be limited in the ability to communicate clearly in an organised manner, and demonstrate limited grammatical accuracy.

Level 2:

Either

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/Guidance

Either responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer a relevant but outline only description in response to the question
- contain some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- demonstrate coverage of some parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- have some direction and focus demonstrated through introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Or responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- show understanding of some but not all of the issues in varying depth
- provide accurate factual information relevant to the issues
- demonstrate some understanding of linkages between issues
- have some direction and focus through appropriate introductions or conclusions
- demonstrate some effective use of language, but be loose in structure and limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight or balance.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- present arguments which have some focus and relevance, but which are limited in scope
- demonstrate an awareness of the specific context
- contain some accurate but limited factual support
- attempt all parts of the question, but coverage will lack balance and/or depth
- demonstrate some effective use of language, be coherent in structure but limited grammatically.

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- be largely analytical but will include some narrative
- deploy relevant factual material effectively, although this may not be comprehensive
- develop an argument which is focused and relevant
- cover all parts of the question but will treat some aspects in greater depth than others
- use language effectively in a coherent and generally grammatically correct style.

Level 5:

As L4, but contains judgement as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

These responses will have the following characteristics: they will

- offer sustained analysis, with relevant supporting detail
- maintain a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed and in places, unconvincing,
- cover all parts of the question with a reasonable balance between the parts
- attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or a summary
- communicate effectively through accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

C: EXEMPLIFICATION OF A LEVEL (A2) DESCRIPTORS

The relationship between the Assessment Objectives (AOs) 1.1, 1.2 and 2 and the Levels of Response.

A study of the generic levels of response mark scheme will show that candidates who operate solely or predominantly in AO 1.1, by writing a narrative or descriptive response, will restrict themselves to a maximum of 6 out of 20 marks by performing at Level 1. Those candidates going on to provide more explanation (AO 1.2), supported by the relevant selection of material (AO1.1), will have access to approximately 6 more marks, performing at Level 2 and low Level 3, depending on how implicit or partial their judgements prove to be. Candidates providing explanation with evaluation and judgement, supported by the selection of appropriate information and exemplification, will clearly be operating in all 3 AOs (AO 2, AO1.2 and AO1.1) and will therefore have access to the highest levels and the full range of 20 marks by performing in Levels 3, 4 and 5.

Level 1:

Either

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such answers will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristic: they

- will lack direction and any clear links to the analytical demands of the question
- will, therefore, offer a relevant but outline-only description in response to the question
- will be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

Assertive responses: at this level, such responses will:

- lack any significant corroboration
- be generalised and poorly focused
- demonstrate limited appreciation of specific content
- be limited in terms of communication skills, organisation and grammatical accuracy.

IT IS MOST IMPORTANT TO DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN THIS TYPE OF RESPONSE AND THOSE WHICH ARE SUCCINCT AND UNDEVELOPED BUT FOCUSED AND VALID (appropriate for Level 2 or above).

Level 2:*Either*

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Exemplification/guidance

Narrative responses will have the following characteristics:

- understanding of some but not all of the issues
- some direction and focus demonstrated largely through introductions or conclusions
- some irrelevance and inaccuracy
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of the language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Analytical responses will have the following characteristics:

- arguments which have some focus and relevance
- an awareness of the specific context
- some accurate but limited factual support
- coverage of all parts of the question but be lacking in balance
- some effective use of language, be coherent in structure, but limited grammatically.

Level 3:

Demonstrates by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 3 responses will be characterised by the following:

- the approach will be generally analytical but may include some narrative passages which will be limited and controlled
 - analysis will be focused and substantiated, although a complete balance of treatment of issues is not to be expected at this level nor is full supporting material
 - there will be a consistent argument which may, however, be incompletely developed, not fully convincing or which may occasionally digress into narrative
 - there will be relevant supporting material, although not necessarily comprehensive, which might include reference to interpretations
 - effective use of language, appropriate historical terminology and coherence of style.
-

Level 4:

Demonstrates by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope.

Exemplification/guidance

Answers at this level have the following characteristics:

- sustained analysis, explicitly supported by relevant and accurate evidence
- little or no narrative, usually in the form of exemplification
- coverage of all the major issues, although there may not be balance of treatment
- an attempt to offer judgement, but this may be partial and in the form of a conclusion or summary
- effective skills of communication through the use of accurate, fluent and well directed prose.

Level 5:

As Level 4 but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question.

Exemplification/guidance

Level 5 will be differentiated from Level 4 in that there will be:

- a consistently analytical approach
- consistent corroboration by reference to selected evidence
- a clear and consistent attempt to reach judgements
- some evidence of independence of thought, but not necessarily of originality
- a good conceptual understanding
- strong and effective communication skills, grammatically accurate and demonstrating coherence and clarity of thought.

D: DECIDING ON MARKS WITHIN A LEVEL

These principles are applicable to both the Advanced Subsidiary examination and to the A level (A2) examination.

Good examining is, ultimately, about the **consistent application of judgement**. Mark schemes provide the necessary framework for exercising that judgement but it cannot cover all eventualities. This is especially so in subjects like History, which in part rely upon different interpretations and different emphases given to the same content. One of the main difficulties confronting examiners is: “What precise mark should I give to a response *within* a level?”. Levels may cover four, five or even six marks. From a maximum of 20, this is a large proportion. In making a decision about a specific mark to award, it is vitally important to think *first* of the mid-range within the level, where the level covers more than two marks. Comparison with other candidates’ responses **to the same question** might then suggest that such an award would be unduly generous or severe.

In making a decision away from the middle of the level, examiners should ask themselves several questions relating to candidate attainment, **including the quality of written communication skills**. The more positive the answer, the higher should be the mark awarded. We want to avoid “bunching” of marks. Levels mark schemes can produce regression to the mean, which should be avoided.

So, is the response:

- precise in its use of factual information?
- appropriately detailed?
- factually accurate?
- appropriately balanced, or markedly better in some areas than in others?
- and, **with regard to the quality of written communication skills:**
generally coherent in expression and cogent in development (as appropriate to the level awarded by organising relevant information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary and terminology)?
- well-presented as to general quality of language, i.e. use of syntax (including accuracy in spelling, punctuation and grammar)? (In operating this criterion, however, it is important to avoid “double jeopardy”. Going to the bottom of the mark range for a level in each part of a structured question might well result in too harsh a judgement. The overall aim is to mark positively, giving credit for what candidates know, understand and can do, rather than looking for reasons to reduce marks.)

It is very important that Assistant Examiners **do not** always start at the lowest mark within the level and look for reasons to increase the level of reward from the lowest point. This will depress marks for the alternative in question and will cause problems of comparability with other question papers within the same specification.

June 2006

Alternative L: The United States, 1877 – 1991

AS Unit 1: United States' Foreign Policy, 1890 – 1991

Question 1

- (a) Use **Source A** and your own knowledge.

Explain briefly the importance of 'NATO' (line 5) in the context of US foreign policy in the years 1946 to 1950. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- L1: Demonstrates basic understanding of the issue using the source, e.g. group of countries, including the USA, prepared to fight for each other. 1
- L2: Demonstrates developed understanding of the issue in relation to both the source and context, e.g. NATO was a military alliance of 12 member nations including the USA and Western Europe, which bridged the Atlantic as a response to events in Europe at the end of World War II. The USA made a commitment to help defend Europe and so was continuing its friendship and involvement. 2-3

- (b) Use **Source B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain how the views expressed in **Source C** challenge those in **Source B** about events in Cuba in 1961. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.2, AO2

Whilst candidates are expected to deploy own knowledge in assessing the degree to which the sources differ/the utility of the source, such deployment may well be implicit and it would be inappropriate to penalise full and effective answers which do not explicitly contain 'own knowledge'. The effectiveness of the comparison/assessment of utility, will be greater where it is clear that the candidates are aware of the context; indeed, in assessing utility, this will be very significant. It would be inappropriate, however, to expect direct and specific reference to 'pieces' of factual content.

- L1: Extracts relevant information about the issue from both sources, with limited reference to the context, e.g. Khrushchev accuses US of backing rebels and Kennedy denies it and states that Khrushchev has misunderstood events. 1-2
- L2: Extracts and compares information about the issue from both sources, with reference to own knowledge, e.g. to show the different attitudes of Khrushchev and Kennedy and shows some awareness that this refers to the failed Bay of Pigs incident in Cuba just after the fall of Batista. Khrushchev is the Russian premier who was in dispute with Kennedy the much younger and charismatic president. 3-5

L3: Extracts and compares information from both sources with reference to own knowledge and draws conclusions, e.g. it was later shown to be a CIA supported venture and so Kennedy is being economical with the truth. Russia was also supporting Castro so they helped to bring the world to the edge of a nuclear war by their posturing. **6-7**

(c) Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

Explain the importance of US mistrust of Soviet Communism, in relation to other factors, in explaining the development of US foreign policy in the years 1945 to 1991. *(15 marks)*

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations, which could apply to almost any time and/or place, based either on own knowledge or the sources. **1-4**

L2: **Either**

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links.

Or

Demonstrates, by limited selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and contain some assertion. **5-8**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, some understanding of the demands of the question. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit and partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

From Source A candidates should understand that mistrust of the Soviets and communism led to the setting up of NATO. From Source B candidates should be able to understand the influence of Russian premiers and the role they played on influencing events and hence the US. There is evidence of mistrust here. From Source C candidates should begin to look at the role of the presidents of the USA – in this instance Kennedy and Cuba. Fear of

communism and especially the spread of Soviet communism after World War II are very important factors which will need to be considered.

Events at the end of the Second World War with the events in East Germany leading to the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Aid etc. also had a bearing on foreign policy, which arguably fuelled further mistrust of Soviet Communism. The political wills of Truman, Eisenhower, and post-Kennedy also influenced foreign policy. They sometimes had their own agendas for how foreign policy developed, not just based on mistrust. Also the relationship between the president and the Russian premiers is another factor to be considered. The UN and events in Korea may be included in some answers as an example of mistrust which existed in the 1950s. Traditional mistrust of communism as a global influence is another factor to consider. Containment was important. Competition with the Soviet Union was a factor, especially in the 1950s and links may be made to the space race. Public opinion was a factor which needs to be considered. The media also influenced events, especially Cuba and Vietnam. Limited credit can be given for mention of the Vietnam War, but candidates are not expected to have detailed knowledge of events in Vietnam. However, détente should also be seen as an attempt to stop the Cold War and develop friendlier relations and this is not linked to distrust but happened for other reasons, e.g. cost, avoidance of nuclear war and individual presidents' desire for peace. Détente may be referred to under both Kennedy and Nixon. Reagan and his resumption of anti-communism in the later period should also be considered. He saw himself as a patriot. Finally, the Gulf War was not about mistrust of the Soviets but about world events linked to the Middle East and oil. Therefore, foreign policy was not solely about mistrust of Soviet communism.

Question 2

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'American interventionism' (lines 1–2) in the context of US foreign policy in Latin America in the years 1890 to 1914. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. American interference in Latin America in Panama. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. American imperialism/interventionism occurred through events in Latin America such as the Spanish War and this was an important part of its foreign policy towards Latin America. Latin America was of interest because of fears for the safety of the US. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the USA wanted to build a canal across Panama. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to link the Pacific with the Atlantic or to get to the US more quickly. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. business wanted it for trade purposes and this is arguably the most important reason. The US wanted to be able to control it and they thought it was strategically important for defence; the US wanted to make money from building it. Also the project would rival the Suez Canal in terms of engineering. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about their relative importance, e.g. the economic reasons were very important because the US was looking for new markets once the frontier had closed down. However, some may argue that defence was the most important reason, i.e. to be able to use it and get to each coast quickly. **6-7**

- (c) ‘Every US President in the years 1890 to 1917 fully supported US imperialism.’
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (15 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**
- L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**
- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**
- L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers are expected to cover a range of presidents and their views on imperialism, giving supporting detail as appropriate. If candidates refer to Benjamin Harrison and/or Grosvenor Cleveland allow suitable comments. President McKinley was a reluctant imperialist but became fully committed on issues like Cuba/Spain because of the pressure from the press and also certain members of Congress. President Roosevelt was an imperialist before, during and after his presidency. He was a rough rider. He was instrumental in the Panamanians getting independence from Colombia. He developed Roosevelt's corollary. Arguably he was the most fully committed to imperialism because his concerns led to interest across the world even into China. President Taft took up foreign policy where Roosevelt left off because he had been recommended by Roosevelt, but even so he was not as committed to imperialism as him. However, events in the Far East and the trade issues needed to be sorted out. He therefore became interested and involved in imperialism. President Wilson was a very reluctant imperialist because he was at heart an idealist but even he interfered in Mexico to protect the interests of the USA. This he undertook with some misgivings but became fully involved once he realised its importance to the US. Therefore each president was to a degree imperialist. Some were natural imperialists some were forced into it by events and various outside pressures.

Question 3

- (a) Explain briefly what is meant by 'Old World Affairs' (line 2) in the context of US foreign policy in the years 1915 to 1920. (3 marks)

Target: AO1.1

- L1: Basic or partial definition of the term, largely based on the extract, e.g. events in Europe/Old World. **1**
- L2: Developed explanation of the term, linked to the context, e.g. the affairs that Harding is referring to is World War One and the Treaty of Versailles and the discussion in the US over the treaty and the League of Nations. **2-3**

- (b) Explain why the USA participated in the 1921–1922 Washington Conference. (7 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2

- L1: Demonstrates understanding of the issue through general and unsupported statements, e.g. to discuss arms/because it was in the USA. **1-2**
- L2: Demonstrates understanding of specific factors explaining the development of the issue through relevant and appropriately selected material, e.g. to reduce arms and control the size of navies, stop another world war, the perception of Japan as a threat, its sphere of influence and to re-affirm its open door in Asia, to lessen costs for itself and Europe post World War One. **3-5**
-

L3: Demonstrates explicit understanding of a range of factors explaining the development of the issue and prioritises, makes links or draws conclusions about its relative importance, e.g. most importantly, the USA's desire to continue its influence in the world without actually getting directly involved, especially with regards to Europe. Asia was within its sights because of Japan's imperialism. **6-7**

(c) 'Foreign policy changed mainly because of pressure from business interests in the years 1919 to 1942.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. **(15 marks)**

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: The answer is excessively generalised and indiscriminating, amounting to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-4**

L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of issues.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a wider range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **5-8**

L3: Demonstrates, by relevant selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of some of the issues relevant to the question. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands but will lack weight and balance. **9-11**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the question and provides a balanced explanation. **12-13**

L5: As L4, but contains judgement, as demanded by the question, which may be implicit or partial. **14-15**

Indicative content

Answers are expected to cover a range of changes, such as the official return to isolationism in terms of political issues and Europe, and the reasons for this. However, the US was not truly isolationist when it came to business, trade, payment of loans etc. Business interests were extremely important in this period. Trade with Asia and Latin America was vital and helped the US to experience a boom in the Twenties. Businessmen had close interests with the Republican Party and arguably helped to shape foreign policy whenever the Republicans were in office. The Republicans wanted to carry on trading and yet not get involved in political struggles. The influence of business and industry lessened for a time in the Thirties because of the Depression.

Other factors to consider are:

Public opinion: this caused the US to think in terms of isolationism after the First World War; although they were mainly sympathetic to the plight of the British at the outbreak of war, some were still reluctant to get involved. Then through a combination of events and Roosevelt's influence they supported and influenced a change and the entry into the Second World War. Eventually business supported the change because it was good for certain industries.

The Republican Party was isolationist in sentiment as were a number of presidents and they influenced the changes towards Europe after the First World War. Roosevelt subtly changed the way the US dealt with Latin America and Asia by developing a less interventionist stance whilst still trying influence events. Geographical proximity of countries influenced foreign policy especially; its sphere of influence, e.g. Latin America and the possible threat to the USA. So, the US was not isolationist here and business benefited and the only change came about through Roosevelt's subtle drawing back. The Depression was also felt in Europe and this also affected foreign policy and the shaping of acts to help them. However, with regards to Europe, businesses put pressure on the government to keep trading, but along with the public were not keen on another war until it benefited them.

June 2006

Alternative L: The United States, 1877 – 1991

A2 Unit 4: Aspects of Domestic Issues in the USA, 1877–1989

Question 1

(a) Use **Source B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How useful are **Sources B** and **C** in explaining the part played by individuals in developing Black Nationalism? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|---|-------------|
| L1: | Identifies/extracts simple statements from the sources which demonstrate agreement/disagreement on the issue. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates explicit understanding of utility/sufficiency etc. with reference to the sources and knowledge of the issue. | 3-5 |
| L3: | Draws conclusions about utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue, with reference to both sources and to own knowledge. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Uses material selected appropriately from both source and own knowledge to reach a sustained judgement on utility/sufficiency in relation to the issue. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

Source B refers to the role that Marcus Garvey played in demanding a home for African Americans. The context is the return to Africa movement that he inspired in the 1920s. This is a radical call for a homeland and to separate from whites, a very unique message at the time. It managed to alienate some other budding black nationalists such as Philip Randolph. Garvey was speaking at a time when blacks were taking part in the Harlem Renaissance.

Source C refers to the role of Malcolm X in developing ‘black pride’ and the context is of the 1960s where other protests took place later, such as at the Olympics of 1968. He was an often controversial figure but a very influential speaker and leader. He was also significant as a black Muslim leader. The 1960s were very turbulent times for the black community.

These sources are useful because they come from two very influential men and as such are reliable for what they are saying. They are useful for the different messages they give. They can tell us about the plans these men had to develop Nationalism, although in different directions. They do not cover every development or idea that Malcolm X or Marcus Garvey contributed to the development of Black Nationalism. There were other influential individuals in the early part of the century such as Du Bois who also was trying to get African Americans to stand up for themselves and move away from the accommodations of Washington. The Black Panther leader, Huey P Newton, was an extremist who took the Black Nationalist movement to a violent conclusion. Also, Stokely Carmichael was influential and, in later years, so were Jesse Jackson and Louis Farrakhan. Therefore both

Sources are useful but cannot be used to explain exactly what happened over the full period, nor do they explain exactly how each brand of nationalism actually developed.

(b) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

‘Whether Republican or Democrat controlled, the Federal government failed to help African Americans to gain constitutional rights in the years 1877 to 1980.’

Assess the validity of this view. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly, or wholly, narrative. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**

L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

This is a synoptic question and candidates’ responses should be rewarded for referring to aspects of change and continuity over a period of at least 100 years, as detailed in the specification for this particular Alternative, and to an appropriate range of factors as exemplified by the indicative content for each particular question.

Source A mentions that the Republicans tried to put into place help for African Americans at the end of the 19th century but that there was no enforcement. The South was clearly doing its best to block measures in the government. Source B refers to the lack of support from the Republican governments of the 1920s for African Americans. Source C refers to the fact that only black politicians could help, so that neither party could help because whites dominated

them. Source D refers to Nixon (who was a Republican) and Carter (who was a Democrat), so of different parties. Nixon and affirmative action is mentioned which helped African Americans. Mixed messages came from the Supreme Court during the Carter years. This source refers to the later period.

In the 19th century neither party showed much interest in constitutional rights for African Americans. The South, which was dominated for many years by Democrats, actively sought to deprive African Americans of their rights. At the beginning of the 20th century there was little interest from the Democrat presidents such as Roosevelt, Wilson etc. In the 1920s and the period referred to in Source B, Republicans were far more interested in business. In the 1930s, when FDR was in office, there was no attention to constitutional rights, but some African Americans benefited from job creation schemes intended really for whites. Truman, a Democrat, did positively help with desegregation of the army. The more conservative Eisenhower (Republican) was forced by Supreme Court decisions to try to support constitutional rights. The Democrats of the 1960s actively promoted constitutional rights and even Nixon (Republican) had to support constitutional rights. Under Carter, where further gains might have been made, there was a white backlash and so the Democrats had to take notice. Hence the lukewarm support for affirmative action. Traditionally the Democrats have represented the interests of African Americans in the 20th century and the Republicans the interests of business etc., but circumstances have sometimes forced each party to act uncharacteristically. Certainly the Republicans have done the least in terms of legislation. Yet the Democrats have been rarely fully committed to constitutional rights because of their Southern white power base in the Senate.

Section B

Question 2 onward

These questions are synoptic in nature and the rewarding of candidates' responses should be clearly linked to the range of factors or issues covered in the question as indicated by the generic A2 levels of response mark scheme and by the indicative content in the specific mark scheme for each question.

Standard Mark Scheme for Essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

L1: ***Either***

Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative.

Or

Answer implies analysis, but is excessively generalised, being largely or wholly devoid of specific information. Such responses will amount to little more than assertion, involving generalisations which could apply to almost any time and/or place. **1-6**

L2: ***Either***

Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.

Or

Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, implicit understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will be dependent on descriptions, but will have valid links. **7-11**

L3: Demonstrates, by selection of appropriate material, explicit understanding of a range of issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**

L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**

L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the selection of a wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Question 2

Assess the extent to which President Johnson rather than President Kennedy was responsible for major changes in education and health policies. *(20 marks)*

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

A comparison is needed of the two presidents, supported by explicit examples of the work they did. Both education and health policies need to be compared and contrasted. JFK was in office for a much shorter period, but he did try to make changes and much of what he proposed for the New Frontier was connected to education in particular. This was an interest he had because it was the key to progress. He proposed federal aid for education but was defeated. He lacked support from Congress for a variety of reasons and so his achievements were limited in both cases. His youth, lack of skill and opposition amongst Southern Democrats all contributed to limitations in his achievements. LBJ was in office for longer and he had the support of both the nation and Congress after the death of JFK. Yet it was JFK who had, arguably, prepared the ground for the far-reaching changes made in Medicare in particular. Also it was his ideas that were later implemented, so the actual major changes came to fruition under LBJ and his Great Society; but without the work, or death, of Kennedy the political will inside Congress for change was weak. The role of LBJ is very important because he put through a number of bills in 1965, which underpinned the major changes in education and Medicare. His political skills with Congress and especially the Senate were formidable. Yet the issue of money undermined some of the changes, especially with the mounting cost of Vietnam. Therefore it is difficult to say which president is the most important but in terms of the longevity of the changes made, and the fact he got them into law, it has to be LBJ.

Question 3

To what extent did President Nixon's actions whilst in office change the political power of the Presidency in relation to that of Congress? (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Nixon whilst in office changed the fine balance between the executive office of the President and legislature. His actions had repercussions for the presidential office into the years after his removal. He made the office of president much stronger and his period in office is often referred to as part of the Imperialist Presidency (from an Arthur Schlesinger book). Nixon began to dictate more than persuade Congress to pass bills. Republican doctrine was seen strongly in his work both domestically and in foreign policy. The White House reasserted its superiority in the early years of his presidency. This can be seen through his handling of the economy and the reluctant support he gave to bussing. The scales of power in this period certainly tipped towards the power of the executive. However, the Watergate issue changed the balance between the Oval Office and Capitol Hill. Candidates will need to explain what happened and relate this to the downfall of Nixon, and hence the demise of respect for the office of president. The shock waves that were felt led to Congress resuming its powerful position in the checks and balances system. The balance tipped its way and Carter and Ford felt the full force of American disappointment in the president. However, arguably Ford made matters worse with a pardon for Nixon. Public opinion had turned strongly against the power of a strong president. It could be argued that Nixon was not the only one responsible for the dominant presidential office. LBJ had been a master manipulator of Congress. Circumstances, e.g. Vietnam, forced the president to act in his role as Chief of the Armed Forces etc. Whilst at war the president could legitimately lead from the front. Congress had gone along with many of LBJ's and Nixon's ideas so they played their own part in letting Nixon's megalomania get out of hand. The Republicans in Congress, as well as the Democrats, had the power to stop Nixon, but most agreed with his philosophy, especially the Republicans with the economy. They voted to give money to him for his policies. Candidates may refer to long-term implications for the Presidency/Congress, e.g. Reagan.

Question 4

Assess the extent to which Presidents Ford and Carter came into conflict with Congress over economic and political issues. (20 marks)

Use standard mark scheme for essays at A2 (*without* reference to sources).

Marks as follows:

L1: 1-6 L2: 7-11 L3: 12-15 L4: 16-18 L5: 19-20

Indicative content

Gerald Ford became president in 1974 when the US was in serious economic decline. The cost of the Vietnam War, combined with the spending of massive amounts on federal programmes such as the Great Society, had created serious problems. It was only a matter of time before unemployment would have to rise, and with the credit boom of the 1970s came inflation at 11%. Ford created WIN. He cut federal spending but caused a recession and a rise in unemployment. Throughout Ford's term of office, Congress enjoyed new power and came into conflict with Ford regarding the bankruptcy of several Northern cities such as New York. Ford had no lasting solution to the oil/OPEC crisis. Ford vetoed bills and then Congress overrode the vetoes. The Democrats in Congress were in the ascendancy. He was even going to veto rescue packages to the cities but was persuaded not to after the Senate committees guaranteed loans. So conflict was evident and it affected the country both economically and politically because the president could not make progress and Congress was in the ascendancy.

Jimmy Carter was elected President in 1976. He presented himself as a fiscal conservative and social reformer. He helped the economy by encouraging home production of oil. He tried to portray himself as honest to raise the esteem of the presidency. He worked with Congress to ease federal control of banks and to pass conservation measures. The Democrat majority in Congress helped him on a few occasions. But because party unity was a thing of the past, Carter lacked the political skills to compromise or accept pork barrel measures, so legislation was slow to be passed as the Democrat majority splintered into its individual concerns. Carter could not unite them but also Carter inherited a lot of political problems regarding the status and role of the president. He was unsuccessful in terms of the economy: it went into full-blown recession in 1980 with inflation at 13%. Therefore, both presidents had less than successful relationships with Congress and there was a lot of conflict, but for different reasons.

June 2006**Alternative L: The United States, 1877 – 1991****A2 Unit 6: The USA and Vietnam, 1963 – 1973****Question 1**

- (a) Use **Source B** and your own knowledge.

Assess the validity of the view in **Source B** about the escalation of US involvement in Vietnam. (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|--|-------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract and the interpretation it contains. | 1-2 |
| L2: | Demonstrates understanding of the interpretation and relates to own knowledge. | 3-5 |
| L3: | As L2, and evaluation of the interpretation is partial. | 6-8 |
| L4: | Understands and evaluates the interpretation and relates to own knowledge to reach a sustained and well supported judgement on its validity. | 9-10 |

Indicative content

Candidates should mention that Source B shows the ‘credibility’ theory about escalation, i.e. that the USA needed to increase the number of soldiers in Vietnam because it needed to maintain its status in the eyes of the world. This was a view that was held by Johnson and a number of advisers. Details of this could be used to support the view. However, there were other military reasons for escalation in 1965, e.g. to protect American soldiers already there as there were heavy casualties from guerrilla activities. Also Johnson needed to prop up the South Vietnamese government. The military was certainly keen to escalate in order to win the war. The influence of the military is an important view. Also public opinion was beginning to turn against the war (public opinion was pro-war in the early 60s. A vocal minority turned against it).

- (b) Use **Source C** and your own knowledge.

How useful is **Source C** as evidence about President Nixon’s strategies to end the war in Vietnam? (10 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO2

- | | | |
|-----|---|------------|
| L1: | Summarises the content of the extract in relation to the issue presented in the question. | 1-2 |
|-----|---|------------|

- L2: Demonstrates some appreciation either of the strengths and/or of the limitations of the content of the source in relation to its utility/reliability within the context of the issue. **3-5**
- L3: Demonstrates reasoned understanding of the strengths and limitations of the source in the context of the issue and draws conclusions about its utility/reliability. **6-8**
- L4: Evaluates the utility/reliability of the source in relation to the issue in the question to reach a sustained and well supported judgement. **9-10**

Indicative content

Source C gives one of Nixon's strategies to end the Vietnamese War, i.e. the Mad Bomber Theory. The strength of this source is that it comes from Nixon and there are witnesses to corroborate what he said (although this was said to an aide). It is clearly very useful. Also he did extensively bomb the communists (and not only in Vietnam) but did stop at a nuclear attack. So events support what is said to a degree. Yet this is only one strategy that he used and its weakness is that it does only give the one idea. Therefore use is limited. Events show that he was involved in diplomatic efforts as well with Kissinger. There was a lot of negotiating done at this point. Kissinger was heavily involved and flying all over the world. Also we do not know whose idea this really was from this source. Nor can we tell how much of this is a bluff and if at any stage he was going to carry this out. Also we do not have the communist side; did they believe he would drop a nuclear bomb?

- (c) Use **Sources A, B, C and D** and your own knowledge.

'US involvement in Vietnam was the result of each president's belief that victory was just around the corner.'

Assess the validity of this opinion. (20 marks)

Target: AO1.1, AO1.2, AO2

- L1: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *either* from appropriate sources *or* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of the question. Answers will be predominantly or wholly narrative. **1-6**
- L2: ***Either***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *either* from the sources *or* from own knowledge, some understanding of a range of relevant issues. Most such answers will show understanding of the analytical demands, but will lack weight and balance.
- Or***
Demonstrates, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, implicit understanding of a wide range of relevant issues. These answers, while relevant, will lack both range and depth and will contain some assertion. **7-11**
- L3: Is able to demonstrate, by relevant selection of material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the issues relevant to the question. Judgement, as demanded by the question, may be implicit or partial. **12-15**
-

- L4: Demonstrates, by selection of a wide range of precisely selected material, *both* from the sources *and* from own knowledge, explicit understanding of the demands of the question and provides a consistently analytical response to it. Judgement, as demanded by the question, will be explicit but may be limited in scope. **16-18**
- L5: As L4, but also shows appropriate conceptual awareness which, together with the wide range of precisely selected evidence, offers independent and effectively sustained judgement appropriate to the full demands of the question. **19-20**

Indicative content

Source A indicates that Kennedy's self-confidence in understanding what was happening was crucial to him in persisting and hence escalating the war in Vietnam. This source lays the blame with Kennedy's personality, and arguably his own arrogance, for the US involvement in Vietnam. Source B indicates that it was the credibility theory that pulled them into the war, i.e. nobody wanted to be seen to lose it. Source C indicates that Nixon was trying to win the war, or at least frighten the communists to the negotiating table, and that he was willing to carry on the involvement. Source D indicates that each President thought they were about to win the war for the US and if they stayed involved they would eventually win. Candidates need to explore the proposition in detail. Certainly the presidents gave every indication that they thought they were about to win and could win and hence pulled the US further and further into the war. This can be supported by the advice they were given from both advisors and the military. Westmoreland kept advising more and more use of hardware. Some candidates may want to make the connection that LBJ inherited JFK's advisors so they were bound to have similar beliefs. Yet, as the sources indicate, there were other reasons for the US to be involved, not just a belief that they were about to win. They were supporting the anti-communist South against the communist North, which can be linked to the long-term belief in the Domino Theory which kept the US involved. Making the world safe for democracy was another belief held. At the beginning there was public support for involvement. Also there were events such as Tet that kept them there. Some candidates may argue against the proposition and decide that there was not just one reason but several working together to produce US involvement.

Historiography: Stalemate theory; Quagmire theory, i.e. Schlesinger's view; military view.