

A-LEVEL

History

Paper 1K The Making of a Superpower: USA, 1865–1975
Additional Specimen Mark scheme

Version: 1.0

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

A-level History Paper 1 Specimen Mark Scheme

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

Section A

- | | | | |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| 0 | 1 | Using your understanding of the historical context, assess how convincing the arguments in these three extracts are in relation to the achievements of Dwight Eisenhower. | [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 historic 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.

Note: in responding to this question, students may choose to respond to each source in turn, or to adopt a more comparative approach of individual arguments. Either approach could be equally valid, and what follows is indicative of the analysis and evaluation which may be relevant.

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

- Herring shows positive approval of Eisenhower’s achievements and reputation, noting that his ‘stock has risen’ with later historians, and that he had many strengths
- Herring also argues that Eisenhower skilfully maintained peace and exuded calm
- Eisenhower is portrayed as shrewd and prudent.

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

- contextual knowledge might be used to suggest that Eisenhower did not keep the military budget under control (many people, including Eisenhower himself, were worried about the military-industrial complex)
- knowledge might be used to challenge the view that the relationship with the USSR over Europe was ‘viable’; there were major crises in 1958 and 1960.

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

- the claim that he provided ‘tranquillity’ and moved away from the ‘addiction to, crisis’
- the claim that he was ‘steadfast’ in confronting the USSR and secured the dominance of the west
- the claim he held back from the serious danger of using atomic weapons.

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

- it could be argued that Newton’s views of Eisenhower ‘peacefully making progress’ are fair and convincing because of successes like Vienna in 1955 and the readiness to take part in summits
- it could be argued that the view of Eisenhower single-handedly saving the world from atomic warfare is over-stated and unconvincing; there were many other factors keeping the world away from the use of nuclear weapons
- knowledge could be deployed in relation to the specific events cited in the extract.

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

- the claim Eisenhower was as much to blame as Dulles for missed opportunities to build peaceful relations and for creation the ‘illusion’ that America could be the world’s policeman
- the claim that Eisenhower ‘failed to develop’ a realistic policy in the Middle East and that he ‘misunderstood China’ and ‘never understood Europe’
- the readiness to praise Eisenhower for his ‘signal achievement’ of maintaining peace.

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

- contextual knowledge of public opinion in the 1950s could be used to support the view about how Eisenhower ‘kept the country at peace’ might be developed
- knowledge could be deployed to challenge or corroborate Eisenhower’s relations with the USSR, China, the Middle East and Europe
- the idea that he created the illusion that the USA was the world’s policeman could be challenged.

Section B

0 2 'Between the end of the Civil War and 1890, the position of African Americans in the United States significantly improved.'

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 there were significant improvements to the position of African Americans, might include:

- legally, slavery was ended and the rights of African Americans were guaranteed by the Constitution
- the federal government pushed through numerous beneficial measures during 'Radical Reconstruction'
- many blacks owned their own land
- many blacks ran successful businesses serving the needs of African American communities
- notable advances were made in schools and education.

Arguments challenging the view that there were significant improvements to the position of African Americans, might include:

- slavery was ended in law but economic dependence continued; being a sharecropper was not so different from life as a slave
- Radical Reconstruction petered out, betrayed by politicians in Washington who gave up trying from 1877
- the reaction of white southerners (lynchings, the KKK, segregationist local political and business leaders) wiped out the gains apparently achieved in 1865 and restored the 'Jim Crow' South
- the total domination of politics and government by the Democrats meant there was no prospect of opposing or changing segregation in the future.

Students may conclude that the thrust of the question is invalid. Clearly, in the period, there were examples of progress made by African-Americans, but the position overall was one of significant discrimination, especially in the Southern states.

0 3 'The Republican Party dominated American politics in the years 1868 to 1912 because it was the party of big business.'

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 Republican Party dominance stemmed from it being the party of big business, might include:

- from 1868 the Republican Party was strongly influenced by business interests, for example over the protective tariff and the economics of 'laissez faire'
- Republican presidents such as Grant and Arthur were strongly criticised for their links to big business and corrupt 'rings'
- the turning point election won by McKinley in 1896 was decided by the political skills of Mark Hanna, using his own business fortune as well as intensive fund raising from pro-Republican businessmen
- Republican presidents like McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt and Taft only ever paid lip-service to and trust legislation
- the foreign policies of Republican presidents were always favourable to business, especially in Latin America and in the Open Door policy in China
- Republican dominance would have continued beyond 1912 but for the splits within the Party that cost the 1912 election (and the dominance was restored, 'business as usual', from 1920).

Arguments challenging the view that the Republican Party dominance stemmed from it being the party of big business, might include:

- in the years from 1868 it was not big business that underpinned Republican dominance, it was Radical Reconstruction and the black vote
- Republican dominance was based on the weakness of the Democrats after the Civil War
- Reconstruction Democrats like Cleveland and the 'Bourbon' faction of the party were just as pro-business as the Republicans
- there was a great divide within the Republican Party between Progressives and conservatives; the Progressive wing often attacked big business and demanded reforms
- Theodore Roosevelt pursued aggressive reformist policies (and was willing and able to split the Republican Party in 1912)
- there were other, more important reasons for Republican dominance, especially the divisions and regionalism of the Democrats, shown when Jennings Bryan failed to get wide enough support outside the South and West in 1896 and 1900.

Students may conclude that it is too narrow a view simply to attribute the Republican dominance to its alliance with big business. Other factors, such as especially the weaknesses of the Democrats, were important and later Republican administrations actually attempted to reform business practices.

0 4 'The policies of US presidents had very little impact on the boom, bust and recovery of the American economy in the years 1920 to 1945.'

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 changing economic fortunes had little to do with the policies of presidents, might include:

- before the Second World War at least, the powers of the federal government were limited
- there was a long tradition in America of 'laissez-faire' and reluctance to regulate the economy
- the Republican presidents of the 1920s did not even try to micro-manage the economy; they just left business to its own devices
- Hoover, eventually and Franklin Roosevelt in the New Deal did try to intervene directly in the economy but had little impact; the economic recovery of the 1930s was limited at best, mostly due to the natural 'rebound effect'
- it was the war, not FDR, that 'got America back to work'.

Arguments challenging the view that changing economic fortunes had little to do with the policies of presidents, might include:

- Harding and Coolidge (and the man they put in charge, Mellon) were directly responsible for the 1920s boom and for letting it get out of hand
- Hoover was responsible for letting the Crash become the Depression, first by doing too little and then by doing the wrong things
- Franklin Roosevelt was guilty of letting the economy collapse in the interregnum between his election and inauguration because he refused to cooperate with Hoover
- FDR's New Deal policies made a huge impact on recovery from the worst of the depression between 1933 and 1939
- there was a huge amount of federal intervention in the economy during the Second World War.

Students may conclude that given the USA's attachment to free markets and laissez faire, administrations had limited impact on economic changes, but that in times of crises, such as the 1930s, this became increasingly less the case. It should also be noted that it was an increase in demand linked to war that finally brought the USA out of depression.