



A-level HISTORY 7042/1K

Component 1K The making of a Superpower: USA, 1865–1975

Mark scheme

June 2023

Version: 1.0 Final



2 3 6 A 7 0 4 2 / 1 K / M S

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer and considered, together with the relevant questions, by a panel of subject teachers. This mark scheme includes any amendments made at the standardisation events which all associates participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process ensures that the mark scheme covers the students' responses to questions and that every associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate analyses a number of students' scripts. Alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Examiner.

It must be stressed that a mark scheme is a working document, in many cases further developed and expanded on the basis of students' 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.

Further copies of this mark scheme are available from aqa.org.uk

Copyright information

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Copyright © 2023 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Level of response marking instructions

Level of response mark schemes are broken down into levels, each of which has a descriptor. The descriptor for the level shows the average performance for the level. There are marks in each level.

Before you apply the mark scheme to a student's answer read through the answer and annotate it (as instructed) to show the qualities that are being looked for. You can then apply the mark scheme.

Step 1 Determine a level

Start at the lowest level of the mark scheme and use it as a ladder to see whether the answer meets the descriptor for that level. The descriptor for the level indicates the different qualities that might be seen in the student's answer for that level. If it meets the lowest level then go to the next one and decide if it meets this level, and so on, until you have a match between the level descriptor and the answer. With practice and familiarity, you will find that for better answers you will be able to quickly skip through the lower levels of the mark scheme.

When assigning a level, you should look at the overall quality of the answer and not look to pick holes in small and specific parts of the answer where the student has not performed quite as well as the rest. If the answer covers different aspects of different levels of the mark scheme you should use a best fit approach for defining the level and then use the variability of the response to help decide the mark within the level, ie if the response is predominantly Level 3 with a small amount of Level 4 material it would be placed in Level 3 but be awarded a mark near the top of the level because of the Level 4 content.

Step 2 Determine a mark

Once you have assigned a level you need to decide on the mark. The descriptors on how to allocate marks can help with this. The exemplar materials used during standardisation will help. There will be an answer in the standardising materials which will correspond with each level of the mark scheme. This answer will have been awarded a mark by the Lead Examiner. You can compare the student's answer with the example to determine if it is the same standard, better or worse than the example. You can then use this to allocate a mark for the answer based on the Lead Examiner's mark on the example.

You may well need to read back through the answer as you apply the mark scheme to clarify points and assure yourself that the level and the mark are appropriate.

Indicative content in the mark scheme is provided as a guide for examiners. It is not intended to be exhaustive and you must credit other valid points. Students do not have to cover all of the points mentioned in the Indicative content to reach the highest level of the mark scheme.

An answer which contains nothing of relevance to the question must be awarded no marks.

Section A

- | | | |
|----------|----------|--|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to American policies in Vietnam. |
|----------|----------|--|

[30 marks]*Target: AO3*

Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of the interpretations put forward in all three extracts and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. Evaluation of the arguments will be well-supported and convincing. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25–30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of the interpretations given in all three extracts and combines this with knowledge of the historical context to analyse and evaluate the interpretations given in the extracts. The evaluation of the arguments will be mostly well-supported, and convincing, but may have minor limitations of depth and breadth. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19–24**
- L3:** Provides some supported comment on the interpretations given in all three extracts and comments on the strength of these arguments in relation to their historical context. There is some analysis and evaluation but there may be an imbalance in the degree and depth of comments offered on the strength of the arguments. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13–18**
- L2:** Provides some accurate comment on the interpretations given in at least two of the extracts, with reference to the historical context. The answer may contain some analysis, but there is little, if any, evaluation. Some of the comments on the strength of the arguments may contain some generalisation, inaccuracy or irrelevance. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7–12**
- L1:** **Either** shows an accurate understanding of the interpretation given in one extract only **or** addresses two/three extracts, but in a generalist way, showing limited accurate understanding of the arguments they contain, although there may be some general awareness of the historical context. Any comments on the strength of the arguments are likely to be generalist and contain some inaccuracy and/or irrelevance. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **1–6**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students must assess the extent to which the interpretations are convincing by drawing on contextual knowledge to corroborate and challenge the interpretation/arguments/views.

In their identification of the argument in Extract A, students may refer to the following:

- although there was no clear policy in Vietnam, presidents from Eisenhower to LBJ wanted to avoid a military conflict but it was Nixon who escalated tension
- Eisenhower could have involved the US military in Vietnam but he avoided escalating the conflict
- following Eisenhower's lead, Kennedy and Johnson both tried to achieve peace, even though there was no clear plan on how to achieve this
- in 1972, Nixon escalated the conflict by sustained bombing of the North in the hope that this would secure a peace deal.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Eisenhower was indeed encouraged to deploy nuclear weapons if the situation in Dien Bien Phu required it. While the plan was supported by many in his administration, Eisenhower decided against it. He believed that the airstrikes would have little effect on the battle and that he did not want to escalate the US' involvement
- Kennedy chose to follow a middle ground in Vietnam and sent military advisers instead of sending arms. Following Kennedy's assassination, Johnson wanted to uphold Kennedy's legacy and did not want to become a 'war president'. There is support in the argument that both tried to follow a policy of reinforcing the South, not all out war. Johnson did try to end his presidency on the path to peace
- it can be supported that part of the reason Johnson's policy did not escalate tension in Vietnam was to ease tension with the Soviet Union. Johnson believed that if he pursued arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, then peace in Vietnam could be negotiated sooner
- in 1972, Nixon ordered the mining of North Vietnamese ports and the bombing of military targets in North Vietnam. Nixon also widened the war by increasing bombing campaigns and attacking Laos and Cambodia.

In their identification of the argument in Extract B, students may refer to the following:

- after the Geneva Agreements, American policy in Vietnam was a sustained military operation which would ensure that the US maintained its interests in Asia
- Eisenhower brought America into the war by undermining the Geneva Agreements and Kennedy escalated the conflict with military aid to the South
- both Johnson and Nixon continued to escalate the war and increased the bombing campaigns in Vietnam
- Nixon's main policy concern was to maintain American interests in Asia, but he was forced into a peace deal in 1972.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- Eisenhower was a real ‘Cold Warrior’ and often attacked Truman for being soft on communism. Believing the Communists would win the 1956 election, the Eisenhower administration propped up the corrupt Diem
- both Eisenhower and Kennedy believed in roll back and massive retaliation. This policy was followed by Johnson who wanted more direct military involvement and secured this through the War Powers Act
- to help convince the American public to support policy in Vietnam, presidents promoted the idea that Vietnam represented a power struggle in the larger Cold War and that America had to maintain Vietnam to secure its position in Asia. Vietnam also had resources, ie rubber, which America needed
- the argument that North Vietnam put pressure on America and Nixon to sign a peace deal and began broadcasting its provisions before Nixon had officially agreed to anything, could well be used to support the idea that Nixon was forced into peace negotiations. Nixon launched the Christmas bombings in 1972 to get the South to agree to the peace settlement.

In their identification of the argument in Extract C, students may refer to the following:

- policy in Vietnam was really shaped around the possible response and future relationship with China
- Eisenhower gained the Vietnam conflict from Truman and his policy was concerned with the entire region falling to Communism
- the policy concerns of all presidents centred on the impact the war would have on China and making sure American actions did not drag China into the conflict
- Nixon believed that by having a better working relationship with China, this would help end the conflict in Vietnam.

In their assessment of the extent to which the arguments are convincing, students may refer to the following:

- the success of the People’s Republic of China in 1949 worried many in America, so during the 1950s, the USA became involved in Vietnam as part of its policy to stop the spread of Communism in Asia, known as the domino theory. If Vietnam fell to Communism, neighbouring countries like Laos and Cambodia would also fall
- the US, during this period, was concerned that China was a more radical and militant Communist power among Asia and did not want its policy in Vietnam to bring China into a much wider war
- some of Johnson’s advisors, for example, wanted him to engage in massive bombing of North Vietnam. Johnson believed this might have led to the Chinese entering the war and so he chose a ‘middle way’ policy
- Nixon realised that a better working relationship with China would improve the situation in Vietnam. Nixon’s opening to China was more about confronting major suppliers of aid to arms to North Vietnam.

Section B

0	2	'The growth of the US economy, from 1865 to 1890, was due to the opening of the West.'
----------	----------	--

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that the growth of the US economy, from 1865 to 1890, was due to the opening of the West might include:

- the vast lands of the West were opened by the railroads and provided links that created national markets. They opened vast areas of the region to settlement and economic development
- African-American settlers also came West from the Deep South, convinced by promoters of all-black Western towns that prosperity could be found there
- there was rapid settlement of the West by people wanting to farm and ranch. The cattle industry rose in importance and expanded the economy, as the railroad provided a practical means for getting the cattle to market
- new resources were discovered in the West, for example gold in the Black Hills, which helped create world trade links for the US.

Arguments challenging the view that the growth of the US economy, from 1865 to 1890, was due to the opening of the West might include:

- other areas within America also stimulated economic growth, for example in the North, growing cities like Chicago were hubs of a wide distribution network. Cotton, tobacco and sugar in the South remained major commodities for export
- mass immigration and rapid population growth, provided cheap, eager labour, many of whom were skilled with both technological and managerial experience
- new processes for making steel and chemicals and new technologies, such as refrigerated ships, were invented which helped the USA leap ahead of Britain for first place in manufacturing output by the 1880s
- the 1880s onwards was a period of big business, for example the oil business, which raised the huge financial investment necessary to start new markets. The Banking Acts established a system of credit that made it easier for businesses to get loans, whilst at the same time inflation allowed industrialists to free themselves of debts.

Students may argue that the opening of the West not only provided access to new resources and new markets, but also encouraged the construction of railroads and other methods of transportation. However, they may also make the link that it was immigration and African-Americans moving into the West that helped the economy. Students may also argue that, equally, new markets and new forms of business technology aided the growth of the economy.

- | | | |
|----------|----------|---|
| 0 | 3 | To what extent did social and ethnic divisions increase in the USA in the years 1890 to 1920? |
|----------|----------|---|

[25 marks]*Target: AO1*

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**
- Nothing worthy of credit. **0**

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that social and ethnic divisions increased in the USA in the years 1890 to 1920 might include:

- from 1890, new immigrant communities, for example, Irish, Polish, stuck closely together and this created political divisions as politicians offered protection and patronage for votes
- the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Anti-Saloon League created divisions between the 'wets' and 'drys', with a battle over public morals and health
- many of the advances made by African-Americans were lost after the First World War. In 1919, racial tensions increased, and riots were commonplace in places such as Chicago. Native-Americans, too, were subjected to discrimination
- there was a fear and backlash against socialism and the spread of communism, especially after 1917. This also led to questions over the loyalties of immigrant communities.

Arguments challenging the view that social and ethnic divisions increased in the USA in the years 1890 to 1920 might include:

- there was in fact a degree of assimilation in this period and immigrant communities did merge together in a 'melting pot'. Many new Americans joined together and willingly adopted American values
- there was also a degree of unity amongst 'progressives' who provided better living and working conditions for the poorest in America
- the outbreak of the First World War brought people together and created a sense of national self-confidence. For example, there were greater opportunities for women during the First World War

and 1920 saw the fight for voting rights come to an end, with the passing of the Nineteenth Amendment

- during the First World War, there was also a greater sense of black identity and African-Americans were encouraged to serve in the war. There was a sense of everyone fighting together against a common foe.

Students may argue that, throughout this period, there were a number of tensions and divisions, especially concerning immigrant communities, that were merely put to one side during the war years. They could argue that although there was a greater sense of unity during the war period, once the war was over, racial tensions increased. However, students may also argue that during this period, there was a call for social reform which led to a sense of unity and togetherness.

0	4	‘In the years 1921 to 1941, all presidents were committed to an increased role for the federal government in domestic politics.’

Assess the validity of this view.

[25 marks]

Target: AO1

Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the full demands of the question. They will be well-organised and effectively delivered. The supporting information will be well-selected, specific and precise. It will show a very good understanding of key features, issues and concepts. The answer will be fully analytical with a balanced argument and well-substantiated judgement. **21–25**
- L4:** Answers will display a good understanding of the demands of the question. It will be well-organised and effectively communicated. There will be a range of clear and specific supporting information showing a good understanding of key features and issues, together with some conceptual awareness. The answer will be analytical in style with a range of direct comment relating to the question. The answer will be well-balanced with some judgement, which may, however, be only partially substantiated. **16–20**
- L3:** Answers will show an understanding of the question and will supply a range of largely accurate information, which will show an awareness of some of the key issues and features, but may, however, be unspecific or lack precision of detail. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be a good deal of comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance, but a number of statements may be inadequately supported and generalist. **11–15**
- L2:** The answer is descriptive or partial, showing some awareness of the question but a failure to grasp its full demands. There will be some attempt to convey material in an organised way, although communication skills may be limited. There will be some appropriate information showing understanding of some key features and/or issues, but the answer may be very limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some, but limited, comment in relation to the question and statements will, for the most part, be unsupported and generalist. **6–10**
- L1:** The question has not been properly understood and the response shows limited organisational and communication skills. The information conveyed is irrelevant or extremely limited. There may be some unsupported, vague or generalist comment. **1–5**

Nothing worthy of credit.

0

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Arguments supporting the view that in the years 1921 to 1941, all presidents were committed to an increased role for the federal government in domestic politics might include:

- Harding addressed Congress on a number of occasions during his time in office and called for an increased federal government role in both the economic and social life of the nation
- Coolidge called for increased federal government support in certain areas, such as child labour laws and civil rights. For example, he repeatedly called for a constitutional amendment forbidding child labour and he signed into law an act granting citizenship to all Native Americans
- although Hoover did not initially support increasing the role of the federal government, he did, from 1930, commit to helping farmers and industry. For example, he stabilised farm prices and committed federal funds to help state governments
- Roosevelt's presidency was committed to reform, recovery and relief and the federal government grew to an unprecedented degree. After 1935, his commitment became even more radical.

Arguments challenging the view that in the years 1921 to 1941, all presidents were committed to an increased role for the federal government in domestic politics might include:

- the Harding administration had extensive corruption and perhaps the least effective, in this period, of increasing the role of the government. It could be argued that he was following the public mood at the time; very limited government intervention
- Coolidge was a firm believer in minimum government involvement in domestic politics with the 'business of America is business' approach
- Hoover believed in 'rugged individualism' and that the government should not intervene in domestic affairs and welfare. Hoover failed to commit to a greater role for the federal government
- although Roosevelt recognised the need for an increased role of the federal government, he was less committed to this being a permanent feature in domestic politics.

Students will most likely argue that throughout the 1920s, Republican presidents resisted an increasing role of the federal government in domestic politics. However, the Republican stance changed when the Great Depression hit; Hoover changed his position by 1930 and FDR completely reversed this trend. However, some students may rightly argue that all presidents saw the need for the federal government to have an important role in domestic politics and called for at least some role in specific areas of domestic life. Students may argue that it was public opinion which limited the opportunities for an increased role in the 1920s.