



History

Paper 2Q (AS) Specimen Question Paper

Question 01 Student 3

Specimen Answer and Commentary

V1.0 26/02/16

Specimen Answer plus commentary

The following student response is intended to illustrate approaches to assessment. This response has not been completed under timed examination conditions. It is not intended to be viewed as a 'model' answer and the marking has not been subject to the usual standardisation process.

Paper 2Q (AS): Additional Specimen question paper

01 With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining McCarthyism in the United States?

[25 marks]

Student response

Source one is an extract from Senator Joseph McCarthy's speech that he made in Wheeling, West Virginia in February 1950. This is of great significance as McCarthy's speech compliments explaining McCarthyism in the United States. McCarthyism is term used to describe a period of severe anti Communist suspicion in the United States, primarily communism in the United States' government.

McCarthyism got its name from Senator Joseph McCarthy claiming he knew all the different people related to communist parties in government. McCarthy in this speech is deliberately trying to cause a stir, he's wanting cause a panic amongst the American people and by doing this, McCarthy is trying to manipulate the American people into thinking that nobody can be trusted in government but him,

and he is their only saviour. McCarthy in his speech is emphasising the threat of communism, he is arguing that Communism is much closer to home than people may assume. He's warning people about communism infiltrating the country and that there is inside politicians who already have links to communist parties. McCarthy claims to have "57 cases of individuals who are loyal to the communist party" he also claims that "It has not been the less fortunate who have been selling this Nation out but those with the finest college education and the finest jobs in Government we can give". When discussing about the cases he has, he's being deliberately vague, simply because he has no proof. McCarthy just accused people in Government to get supporters. This is the start of the McCarthy campaign, accusing people without any proof and is effectively what McCarthyism is. The tone in which McCarthy is saying this is in quite a dramatic and threatening manner. He does this by indicating it's the people at the very top who "shape our foreign policy" that gives the tone a threatening edge as he's implying the government is being ran by communists. But there is also a sense of urgency as he's trying to get votes from the public by scaring them with the threat of communism soon to take over unless he gets into a position of power. This source is incredibly valuable when it comes to explaining McCarthyism in the United States, for a number of solid reasons. One reason is simply because it is from Senator Joseph McCarthy himself, where McCarthyism is named after him. A second reason is because this source is an extract of the exact speech McCarthy made where he started to address those who were communist in government.

And lastly, because of what he said in his speech in this extract. McCarthy said he had 57 cases in his hand of communist individuals who were in government, but remained vague when naming them. McCarthy always did this, he claimed to know everyone related to the communist party but told nobody for the sheer fact he assumed and pretended to know, which is incredibly useful in explaining McCarthyism. It's also useful as he accuses the people in government for being Communist which was a common theme in his speeches after this one in West Virginia. It was simply a campaign against alleged communists in government. However, to as much as this source may be useful, it may not also be useful too. This is because this speech is made for the public and so it is very

possible everything he has said has been filtered to manipulate the audience by pleasing them trying to get them onside with him. So even though at first glance it looks set to be extremely useful as it's from Senator McCarthy himself and what he said was typical of the McCarthy era, it's a possibility it may not be completely useful.

Source Two is an extract from the memoirs of the US radio broadcaster Raymond Gram Swing which was published in 1954. This is about the time when McCarthyism was coming to an end as this was year later McCarthy was ousted from power. Source two is a reply to source one effectively because he mentions when McCarthy made his speech at Wheeling in the first sentence. Swing in his memoirs is arguing that even though he started McCarthyism and his campaign ended with the "condemnation by a Senate committee in 1954" and that he became a "name-symbol" which is what he wanted, he can't be blamed solely for his campaign. Swing is trying to get his point across that there is a bigger picture to this whole incident and it's not just McCarthy's fault there are other areas to blame. This is because he believes communist fear already existed before McCarthy and that the Korean War would still have happened even if McCarthy didn't say anything. He argues though he still did more damage in the US and western democratic countries than good than any other person and thus didn't really achieve anything. Swing says that the only reason McCarthy raised the communist issue was to try and get the public onside with him and which would make McCarthy more well known, wise and powerful so people would start supporting him. Swing's tone in this source is one that seems reasonable and measured. He doesn't seem too angry with McCarthy after he disliked him for having to resign after being attacked by McCarthy. Large parts of this source are useful when explaining McCarthyism in the United States. One reason for why it would be useful is because Swing has no links to politics. This means there would be no political agenda or goal in mind, it's solely Swing's opinion on the matter of McCarthy and McCarthyism. This also means it's unfiltered, things don't have to be censored as he is under no political obligation to not say certain things, which therefore makes the source very valuable because things may not to an extent been exaggerated. Another reason which makes the source useful is that Swing had direct involvement with McCarthy and as a result would be expected to know quite a lot about McCarthy and McCarthyism as he worked with him directly, being able to give valid opinions. Lastly, as the tone in this essay is measured and reasonable considering the events that happened between Swing and McCarthy in the past, you can argue that, Swing's memoir comes across as unbiased as he supports McCarthy and tries to fend off all the blame towards him. This would suggest the source is very useful because of its potentially not completely biased nature. However, having said that, one thing that is not potentially useful, is the fact that it's from Swing himself. As Swing had to resign from the radio station after being attacked by McCarthy, it is very likely he would take a biased approach when casting his views on McCarthyism, as he has had a bad experience with it personally and therefore may want to portray McCarthyism in a negative and potentially false way. These two sources however, even though are from men who dislike each other link in some way. For example, both talk about the massive threat of communism: Swing argues that McCarthy can't take all the blame as the Red Scare is bigger than McCarthy and existed before his speeches. Whilst McCarthy argues similar points in which he says that he has "57 cases" in which individuals are related somehow to the Communist parties. Both suggest that Communism is bigger than anyone might have thought. As Swing believes it already existed before it was named by Senator McCarthy where similarly, McCarthy says that it's those in government with the best jobs and education where it is existing as some of the government officials are communist.

When concluding both of these sources by McCarthy and Swing, it is evident that both sources are very valuable in explaining McCarthyism in the United States at the time. Source two, is incredibly

valuable when explaining McCarthyism in the US. Swing in his memoirs does not have to filter anything he is saying because he has no political agenda and is under no political obligations and so therefore on the one hand may be inclined to say the truth. However, it may not be as valuable as source one when explaining McCarthyism as the extract could include some biasedness as Swing was forced to resign after McCarthy attacked him, which therefore may affect what Swing has to say. This may possibly result in being a less valuable source when explaining McCarthyism in the United States. I therefore believe that Source one is the most valuable source when explaining McCarthyism in the United States. Although, McCarthy's speech may be filtered, it is still directly from him, where McCarthyism got its name. Also, content in the source explains McCarthyism as he accuses individuals in government being loyal to communist parties and claiming he has cases of people who are communist in his possession but never revealed their identities. This epitomises McCarthyism as this is exactly what is what: Accusations and being deliberately vague regarding important details to his claims.

Commentary – Level 3

Overall, this is a limited answer. It relies a great deal on summarising the content of each source without clear reference to knowledge of context to assess the value of either. There is, for example, a reasonable assumption that there would be references to HUAC in relation to both sources and McCarthy's influence in it and the reference to the Korean War in relation to Source B is undeveloped and unconvincing. Whilst there is comment on provenance and tone and how these might affect the value of the sources, these are somewhat generalised in places, especially in relation to Source A. It is a low Level 3 answer.