

SAMPLE ANSWER AND STRUCTURE FOR A LEVEL PAPER: USA 1865 – 1975
SECTION A QUESTION 1

The argument put forward by Extract A is that Eisenhower was a levelheaded president who “remained calm” and skillfully maintained peace throughout his time in office. **The extract also suggests that** Eisenhower was a shrewd and confident leader, not an “intellectual lightweight” as first thought. **Herring explains that** the reputation of Eisenhower as a golf playing part-time politician has been removed, and revisionists now see his personal experiences as Supreme Allied Commander during World War Two has allowed him to have many strengths for his role in the White House. **This is quite a convincing argument. The extract also rightly comments on** Eisenhower keeping the peace and avoiding direct confrontation during his time, despite potential hotspots in Berlin, the Middle East, Far East and even Cuba.

Although the extract suggests that Eisenhower avoided “open-ended military commitments” **this argument could be challenged.** At the end of the 1950s the USA was in discussions with Macmillan’s Britain about the positioning of Polaris submarines in Holyloch, Scotland. By 1961 the first was stationed and the arms race went in yet another direction for many years to come. There was also the secret air war, a vast espionage effort pushed by the military, against the Soviet Union and China. U2 spy plane missions escalated and even resulted in Gary Powers being shot down in 1960. Furthermore involvement in Cuba after Castro’s takeover in 1959 led to Ike’s part with the CIA in planning Operation Mongoose and the future Bay of Pigs invasion that was carried out under Kennedy’s watch. Then there as the USA’s role in Vietnam from 1954 after the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu, this military involvement was to last to 1973 and **clearly shows a flaw in Herring’s argument.**

However the argument in Extract A that Eisenhower “kept the military budget under some semblance of control” does have credibility as despite inheriting a large budget from Truman, Ike reduced it considerably and then more or less maintained the budget at the same level throughout his 8 years in office. **This supports Herring’s overall view that** Eisenhower deserves some praise for remaining calm and collected during a period of Cold War confrontations and escalation of the arms and space races.

NOW YOUR TURN FOR EXTRACTS B AND C !!!

Extract B offers the argument that Eisenhower was successful at maintaining ‘tranquility’ and ‘steadfastly confronting’ communism during a period of high tension between world powers. **This extract is complementary of** Eisenhower in his efforts to not resort to ‘global confrontation’ citing the Korean War, Berlin and Vietnam where the Cold War could have developed into a hot war. **The extract also suggests that** Eisenhower was successful in dealing with the threat of ‘Soviet communism’, which is supported by the Geneva and Paris summits and Eisenhower’s roll back policy. **Therefore this is quite a convincing argument.**

However, although the extract implies that one of Eisenhower's greatest achievements was 'to have access to atomic weapons and not use them' tis view could be challenged and underpinned as an exaggeration. While it is true that Eisenhower did face pressure from hawks to utilize America's nuclear power, it was only Truman who had ever had access to it, and used, nuclear weapons; immediately regretting it and being condemned by many for this decision. **Moreover the argument that** he 'nurtured' the peace in Europe **can be seen as invalid** as he refused to intervene in Hungary, due to upcoming elections, despite encouraging the uprising and also in the Paris talks he refused to apologise following the USSR's shooting down of the U2 spy plane. **This clearly shows a flaw in Newton's argument and this makes the extract less convincing.**

Extract C alternatively suggests the Eisenhower was largely unsuccessful and that his 'single' achievement was that he kept the country at peace. **Graubard takes a negative view** of Eisenhower claiming that he 'neglected', 'pretended' and 'failed utterly' in his policies. It is true that to a large extent Eisenhower ignored the opportunities offered with destalinization and the thaw in the Cold War, opting instead to play golf. **The argument that** he 'never understood' Europe **is convincing** as shown in the failure of his roll back policy and his inaction in the Hungarian uprising.

"Big business, not big government, was the reason for the dynamic growth of the American economy in the years 1890 to 1918"

<p>Plan:</p> <p>Without a doubt big business was a profound reason for the dynamic growth and 'Second Industrial Revolution' of the USA from 1890 to 1917, for they drove the expansion of the abundance of natural resources in industrial growth as well as employed much of the labour force and facilitated exports to the world through increasing interconnectedness of world economies. While big government may have a slight impact in facilitating growth within agricultural sectors, it remained mostly laissez faire and in fact the 'small government' and minimal government interventionist stance was what facilitated growth along with big business in this time period.</p> <p>Big government thus less important : little impact, mostly laissez faire, ie didn't help with strikes, 1890 mckinley tariff 'small government' and repealed Sherman silver purchase act.</p>	<p>Point 1: Big business Big business yes: corporations drove growth, steel and Carnegie, oil wells and Rockefeller. Achieved take off. Helped west with connections to railroads</p> <p>Further seen during war with underwriting loans J.P Morgan. Big business drove growth of the economy in this period due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Growth of natural resources which allowed economy to achieve take off- 90% 1895-1900 and 1908-1913 another 77% surge in exports. -Facilitated by rise in steel exports i.e discovery of high grade iron ore in Minnesota. Messabe range of hills in 1892 led to by 1907, 75% of it bought up by US Steel, the business consolidated empire and trust -Similar doing's with oil and Rockefeller controlling rise of expansions -Businesses so powerful that by 1900, 4% biggest companies controlled 54% of the US industry and since the rapid industrialisation of America drove growth this shows extent to which big business and not big government drove dynamic growth -Also the impact of Eastern financial hubs allowed Western coasts like San Francisco and New Orleans 	<p>Point 2: Big government thus less important: little impact, mostly laissez-faire, i.e. didn't help with strikes, 1890 McKinley tariff 'small government' and repealed Sherman silver purchase act.</p>	<p>Yes 'big government' i.e. helped agriculture i.e. farm loan acts etc. Allowed big ag i.e. cotton biggest export still. But ag small part of economy and boom more so due to world demands and general market prosperity following 1900. Also weakness of gov seen in 1907 where their little regulation of banks and failure of gold reserves needed jp morgan and financiers- inability to curb power of financiers</p>	<p>Conclusion:</p>
---	---	---	---	--------------------

'In the years 1890 to 1914, American society changed dramatically'. Assess the validity of this view

<p>Introduction: While USA changed dramatically in regards to the impact of urbanisation and mass immigration in the North East predominantly, these changes were isolated from the South and West, which remained economically and socially distant from the changes in the North and thus did not change to the same extent. Moreover while society may have changed in regards to changing demographics and 'new' immigrants introducing a range of ethnicities and values in the city, values remained entrenched with 'Nativist' views and hostility to 'new' immigrants and African Americans in the North and South.</p>	<p>Point 1: To an extent, society changed dramatically when one isolates the impact mass immigration had on the North East as well as the impacts of industrialisation and thus urbanisation. -18.4 m immigrants- with many Jews ie coming to stay and settle- only 3% rate of return. Formed skilled labour and added to work force and consumer demand. Italians also shaped 'Little Italy' for example. 'New immigrants'. They contributed massively to the dynamism of industrial growth which was seen in North-East with rise of urban skyline and booming cities like Ohio. Growth of mass entertainment i.e nickelodeons and small cinemas etc. as well as impacts in small-town American cities with upto 30,000 people. By 1900, 38 cities has population of over 100,000. This urbanisation further seen with 'great migration' of AA to the North further allowing changing demographics of North and more than anything, a growing disparity between the city. However- this wasn't necessarily a change in society for 'nativist' views seemed to remain: -Gompers/AFL accepted but many workers blamed 'foreign agitators' on Pullman Strike/Homestead Steel Strike 1894/1892 who were often used or feared to be used to undercut wages or used to break up strikes. -Promotion of Eugenics and fears of 'demarcation' of immigrants- social hierarchy</p>	<p>Point 2: Moreover, while the North arguably had a degree of social change, this was at a stark difference to that of the South and West. The South especially was economically isolated with retention of King Cotton and 'big agriculture' limiting urbanisation and growth. They were politically reliant on S state government's and socially, not only did AA's remain disenfranchised and segregated, they did not benefit from the rapid growth of immigration and industrialisation like the South. The impact of this was seen in the rural-urban migration away from the South from 1910 and reluctance of immigrants to arrive there. Similarly in the West, while there were some social changes with the arrival of Mexican migrants, AA's and ranchers/prospectors carving up the land, society remained transient and subject to concepts of 'rugged individualism' which meant it remained isolated from the dynamism of growth and social change like the North. It mostly consisted of boom and bust mining towns such as Victor, Colorado which didn't allow for a stable population to grow to become accustomed to social change. Thus it cannot be argued America underwent social change for the North-East and the extent of social change which occurred could not be seen in the South and West.</p>	<p>Point 3: The extent to which American society did not change dramatically can be clearly seen in the position of African American from 1890-1914 and how they remained the victims of white supremacists in society, particularly in the South. This was seen with the rapid amounts of lynching which took place, which from 1889-1915, over 3700 took place with 85% black victims but only 4 perpetrators sentenced. This discriminatory action against African Americans was seen with local politics also with a infamous example of Ben Tillman, a Governor of South Carolina who, with enormous clout in the Democrat Party, encouraged and engaged in such lynch mobings- with a ability to separate their state government from federal government particularly. This marginalised AA's to the lowest social strata and meant not only were they victimised, politically repressed. This was seen with SS rulings like 1896 Mississippi grandfather clause to ensure disenfranchisement, but in fact extended to fed gov with 1896 Plessy vs Ferguson. It shows how despite claims of tolerance in the North with many state encouraging civil rights legislation on their books in the north, attitudes were clearly entrenched against AA's. Arguably there was an extent of change with Washington but even he, a model of black success, was accused on accommodating with working within 'segregation' and white supremacy in his 1895 Atlanta Compromise. Similarly reactions to arrivals of AA in the North weren't positive ie AA North riots ie Springfield Illinois and 1900 New York and shows despite claims of</p>	<p>Conclusion: Therefore despite obvious demographic and population changes in American society, namely seen within the North, this did not translate to actual views and opinions within society in this time period. People in the South mostly remained entrenched within the perception of AA as socially inferior as well as both S-W unable to engage in urbanisation and impact of immigrants in their cities like the North did. Yet even they failed to encourage huge social change, due to remaining 'Nativist' views of the 'new' immigrants' and their impact on jobs and cities. Thus no dramatic change and attitudes remained vastly similar to that of the Gilded</p>
---	--	--	---	---

"Assess how convincing the arguments in these extracts are in relation to the US presidency between 1945 and 1960"

<p>Extract A: Argues that Truman's presidency in these years was seemingly overshadowed by FDR's legacy and due to the pressure from the bipartisan coalition that dominated Congress, he faced difficulty getting social reforms passed after his reelection in 1948. Corroborated as Truman came into the administration as 'safe pair of hands'- unintended V.P.- disliked by much of his own party. Indeed in 1948 before the NC, liberals wanted George Wallace for the presidency, or some wanted Eisenhower, a Republican. As the historians' reflect, this poses a contrast to 'Roosevelt's' 'master coalition builder' especially in 1940 which was composed of the 'Solid South', party organisations in the cities and the youth/ethnic minorities/workers. Indeed, unlike FDR's ability to overcome opposition from the Left and Supreme Court in his Second New Deal, Truman limited by 'legislative warfare'- especially with BB. Reinforces Truman's weakness of his political power. Extract also argues due to Congressional opposition, many of Truman's 'Fair Deal' reforms couldn't occur, which can be corroborated since Truman aimed in his 1945 Full Employment Bill to introduce a NHI scheme and farmer price reforms yet was opposed by lobbying interest groups like American Medical Association. Though he was able to extend the Social Security Act in 1950 and raise the N.M.W to 75 c, it can be compared to the 1960's presidents such as Kennedy and Johnson, of the limits of his social reforms and hence as argument suggests' his</p>	<p>Extract B: Graubard has a rather hostile view of Eisenhower's presidency in which he argues his elitist and militaristic style of government failed to allow him to become a social reformer, and instead remained out of touch with the electorate. To an extent may be corroborated as- 'lost touch with the Kansas' world maybe with his appointment of billionaires into his Cabinet and lack of attempts to implement a NHI scheme like Truman prior to him. He believed in a 'small government' which may support Graubard's depiction of him as an 'alliance-builder' unable to connect to the poor and citizens of America. Indeed he focused on balancing the budget 3 times in 1959/1950 and was a fiscal conservative Republican. This 'hidden-hand' presidency thus declared a passivity to his administration and hence meant as Graubard considers, meant he was 'out of his depth in the White House' in regards to domestic policies in comparison to foreign affairs. This passivity is reinforced with his reactions to the rise of McCarthyism- did little but happy when imploded in 1954- failed to support fellow army general, George Marshall on his election tour in 1952- depicts him as 'failed citizen' and weakness as a president to help others. Did little to help CRM besides Little Rock and desegregation of schools in 1954. Yet Graubard's portrayal of Eisenhower as 'blinded to anything that might be mistaken for a social vision' is slightly exaggerated. He did continue Truman's Fair Deal to an extent, with a rise in the NMW, added 4</p>	<p>Extract C: Newton argues in Extract C that the American presidency in 1960 took a toll on the loss the Republican party in 1960, both Eisenhower and Nixon, the latter of whom ran against Kennedy. Newton's argument may be corroborated for, despite Eisenhower's initial distrust of Nixon due to the 1952 Slush Fund Scandal, the defeat was taken badly by Eisenhower. Similarly Nixon accused the election victory of 'dirty tricks' due the Mayor stuffing the ballot boxes in Illinois which allowed Kennedy's several thousand win of the state, explaining Nixon's 'bitter[ness]' at the outcome of the election. The argument reflects how due to the inability of Nixon's initial tactics in regards to supporting civil rights and diverting himself from conservatives, to work in allowing him the victory, it pushed the Republican party to adopt other tactics such as the later 'Southern Strategy' which helped Nixon not only in 1968 but also 1972. This corroborates Newton's argument</p>
---	--	--