



A-level HISTORY 7042/1K

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

Mark scheme

June 2019

Version: 1.0 Final

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 Assessment Writer.

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

System Name	Description
?	Questionable or unclear comment or fact
^	Omission – of evidence or comment
Cross	Inaccurate fact
H Line	Incorrect or dubious comment or information
IR	Irrelevant material
SEEN_BIG	Use to mark blank pages or plans
Tick	Creditworthy comment or fact
On page comment	Use text box if necessary to exemplify other annotations and add further comment. Always provide a text box comment at the end of each answer.

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, i.e. 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.

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

Section A

- 01** Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the US governments' economic policies from 1929 to the end of the 1940s. **[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**
- 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.

Extract A: In their identification of Badger’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- under Hoover, voluntary aid was encouraged, and was received positively by many, at the start of the 1930s
- from the mid-1930s, various New Deal agencies were under-funded and did little to kick start the economy
- it was foreign policy, from 1939 onwards, rather than domestic economic policy, which rescued the economy.

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

- Hoover’s popularity came from his ideas of American individualism and cooperation. However, students may argue that his economic policies were flawed and largely unsuccessful
- the NRA did not help recovery and, in reality, did little except give large firms the opportunity to resume unfair practices. Social security was inadequate and it was both conservative and limited in its provision
- students may argue that although economic recovery was limited, it did set an important precedent of federal government giving direct funds for relief
- the Second World War and subsequent Cold War tensions did indeed lead to economic growth, with increased spending and almost full employment.

Extract B: In their identification of Zinn’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- unregulated spending and speculation and lack of intervention from Hoover worsened the Depression
- recovery programmes throughout the 1930s and 1940s, were wide ranging; aimed at farmers, those working in the cities, pensioners and the unemployed
- the New Deal went far and above any previous legislation to promote economic recovery and, under Truman, there was impressive recovery with the Fair Deal.

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

- Hoover was slow to act and relied on phrases and team spirit only. The start of the 1930s saw a delayed response from government to an urgent economic crisis, where unemployment soared from 3% to almost 25% in 1933
- the New Deals were revolutionary – labour unions were allowed to take their place in labour relations and relief agencies were set up to offer hope to millions and, in turn, this led to a greater role for state and local governments as partners
- unemployment was significantly reduced, although students may argue that it was still at 9 million by 1940
- wages in 1940 were almost back to the levels of 1920, although students may argue that they were still slightly lower (\$23 in 1940 and \$25 in 1929)
- under Truman, spending continued and purchasing power increased into the 1950s.

Extract C: In their identification of Rauchway’s argument, students may refer to the following:

- the economic crisis was unprecedented and the government was unorganised and unprepared
- Hoover was merely following the expected path towards recovery and Roosevelt tried his best to overcome opposition and pass more liberal policies
- opposition against intervention was strong and it was only by the late 1940s that economic policy began to change.

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

- Hoover was following a general policy for crisis management that was already clearly established, which was supported by leading bankers and industrialists
- Republicans, Democrats, bankers, the Federal Reserve could not agree on a clear way forward and under Hoover, more than 20% of banks failed
- whilst Roosevelt tried to pass many reforms, the Supreme Court blocked them or watered them down, e.g. the NRA, AAA, CCC, which created policy chaos
- it wasn’t until the European Recovery Programme at the end of the 1940s that the government began to realise that a new programme of assistance was needed.

Section B

02 'Laissez-faire policies, in the years 1865 to 1890, were economically damaging.'

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 laissez-faire policies, in the years 1865 to 1890, were economically damaging might include:

- there was unregulated and uneven expansion of the American economy, e.g. northern railroad corporations were in hostile competition with any southern challengers who might arise and they promoted 'northern' economic interests rather than 'American' interests
- it opened up opportunities for political corruption within the economy, e.g. governments granting contracts to companies with the biggest kickbacks, as seen with William 'Boss' Tweed. This, in turn, led to the collapse of smaller businesses
- big business developed through these policies but they thrived ruthlessly. There was a degradation of working conditions and workers were exploited rather than supported. Furthermore, legislation driven by the Granger Movement and Knights of Labor was ineffective
- laissez-faire policies led to the Panic of 1893 which was a period of serious economic upheaval and lasted until 1897. Some big businesses had overextended themselves (railroad), thanks to a lack of government intervention, and this led to economic crisis.

Arguments challenging the view that laissez-faire policies, in the years 1865 to 1890, were economically damaging might include:

- laissez-faire policies allowed that anyone, big or small, could make their fortune free from government interference, e.g. the textiles and garment industries. This led to real wage growth of 60% between 1860 and 1890
- students may argue that the main consequence was in fact the creation, and ultimate regulation (beginning with the Interstate Commerce Act), of new types of corporations throughout America, particularly benefiting farmers in Western or Southern Territory
- it led to the economic realignment of the West which saw greater organisation and brought it more in line with the North. The West was economically revolutionised; immigrants were allowed to move in and an abundance of raw materials could move out
- there were positive effects in the South, e.g. Birmingham, Atlanta, became the centre of a thriving iron industry and the railroad opened up the South, e.g. Southern Pacific, which allowed it to trade more easily with northern neighbours.

Students may conclude that although laissez-faire policies created opportunities, such as entrepreneurship, unregulated business practices led to widespread corruption and price fixing. Therefore, students might conclude that, overall, policies were damaging.

- 03** 'The Immigration Acts of the early 1920s were the result of social tensions arising from immigration since the 1890s.'

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 Immigration Acts of the early 1920s were the result of social tensions arising from immigration since the 1890s might include:

- between 1890 and 1914, 15 million immigrants arrived to the USA, mainly from southern and eastern Europe – Italy, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Western Poland and Greece – which was a break from the old, traditional immigrants that arrived from Britain and France. Older immigrants saw themselves as well-spoken, educated and having useful skills. Newer immigrants were often illiterate and unskilled with poor or no English. There was a push to maintain the status quo – the immigration restrictions of the 1920s were calibrated to preserving the historic ‘national origins’ of the American population. The growth of racist or sectarian opposition led to the growth of the KKK after 1915
- there was a high level of conflict between nationalities in the great cities, outlined in the 1911 Dillingham Report, and the emergence of the new concept of Americanism did not help. Many new immigrants did not socialise or integrate with existing communities, e.g. China Town in New York
- 1890–1920, arriving immigrants centred around cities which led to crowded conditions and an increase in disease. The 50 new cities had more than 100,000 immigrants each. Jacob Riis’s ‘How the Other Half Live’, in 1890, showed that there were attempts to clear cities of slums but not enough had been done by even the progressive governments, e.g. Hell’s Kitchen in Manhattan
- groups like the WCTL, Anti-Saloon League, and prohibition movement, believed that many social problems were linked to newly arriving immigrants, e.g. an increase in crime, gambling and drunkenness. They fostered resentments towards immigrant communities, who typically argued against prohibition.

Arguments challenging the view that the Immigration Acts of the early 1920s were the result of social tensions arising from immigration since the 1890s might include:

- the fear of Communism due to the Red Scare in 1919 worried many Americans. Although many Russian immigrants were actually escaping communism, Americans opposed their supposed left-wing politics
- immigrants were seen as an economic threat as they offered cheap, unskilled workers and could be used to break strikes; they were used to weaken trade unions, e.g. the AFL and Samuel Gompers. The acts were also a response to ‘Yellow Peril’. From 1890, there had been numerous exclusion acts against the Chinese and Japanese, e.g. the McClatchy Company, who argued they were a threat to farmers. Immigration acts were passed for purely economic reasons as, after the 1919 recession, the acts allowed the government to increase the amount of tax immigrants could pay
- the trauma of the First World War led to the passing of the acts. In 1890, New York was home to as many Germans as Hamburg, Germany. By 1914, when the war broke out, opposition between Americans and German immigrants peaked
- there was great concern regarding the influence immigrants had in politics. Tammany Hall played a major role in controlling New York City and New York State politics and helping immigrants, most notably the Irish, rise up in American politics.

Students may conclude that social tensions, such as the degradation of cities and the concerns of worsening social conditions, caused the acts to be passed, but that economic concerns were just as important, along with rising political/foreign policy concerns. Any meaningful conclusion would be valid.

- 04** How successful were attempts by US governments, in the years 1955 to 1975, to reduce Cold War tensions? **[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 attempts by US governments were successful in reducing Cold War tensions in the years 1955 to 1975 might include:

- in 1955, under Eisenhower, Khrushchev agreed to the peaceful use of atomic energy with the USA and signed the Austrian peace treaty
- the 1960s and 1970s saw the policy of détente, where the two superpowers eased tensions and tried to cooperate to avoid conflict in the Cold War. The Nixon administration promoted greater dialogue with the Soviet government, including regular summit meetings and negotiations over arms control and other bilateral agreements
- 1963 saw the Partial Test Ban Treaty where both the USA and the USSR agreed to stop testing nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. This was followed by a number of ‘friendly’ events – in 1971, the US table tennis team played in China and in 1972, the US President Nixon visited China
- in 1971, the US dropped its veto and allowed China to join the United Nations followed by the 1975 Helsinki Agreement. This agreement was signed by 35 countries including the USA and the USSR. These countries were signing up to recognise the European borders established after the Second World War as well as to some basic human rights such as freedom of speech. This effectively meant that the Western Allies recognised Soviet control over Eastern Europe. It also meant that, after decades of communist dictatorship, the Soviet Union had signed up to a basic human rights agreement.

Arguments challenging the view that attempts by US governments were successful in reducing Cold War tensions in the years 1955 to 1975 might include:

- military spending continued to increase between the 1950s and 1970s and there were many foreign entanglements of the various presidents, e.g. Eisenhower and U2, JFK and Cuba/Berlin Wall, and the Vietnam War. The two superpowers never engaged directly in full-scale armed combat, but they were heavily armed in preparation for a possible all-out nuclear world war. An intense stage of the Cold War was in 1958–62. The US and USSR began developing intercontinental ballistic missiles, and in 1962 the Soviets began secretly installing missiles in Cuba that could be used to launch nuclear attacks on US cities
- in 1972, SALT 1 was criticised by some for not limiting the production of new nuclear weapons. Also, neither Russia or America kept to the SALT1 agreement. Neither side reduced their conventional weapons. Further talks were much less successful
- in the 1970s, the relationship between the USSR and China, the world’s most important communist nations, had soured. This was known as the Sino-Soviet split. There was not an easing of tension but rather the USA acting as an opportunist. The split complicated relations within the communist sphere, while US allies demonstrated greater independence of action
- by 1975, relations with communist Cuba, who had Soviet support, were still tense. The CIA had targeted Allende for removal and operated to undermine his support domestically, which contributed to a period of unrest culminating in General Augusto Pinochet’s coup d’état on 11 September 1973.

Students may well argue that whilst there was some success towards reducing tensions, e.g. arms limitation, there was still very much a Cold War divide. Ideological differences remained but the need for stronger economies led to a greater level of diplomacy. Good students might differentiate between levels of ‘success’ and analyse success in relation to aims.