
A-LEVEL

History

Component 2Q The American Dream: reality and illusion, 1945–1980

Mark scheme

7042

June 2017

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

June 2017

A-level

Component 2Q The American Dream: reality and illusion, 1945–1980

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying Johnson's Great Society.

[30 marks]

Target: AO2

Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within the historical context.

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Shows a very good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with a strong awareness of the historical context to present a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. The answer will convey a substantiated judgement. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **25-30**
- L4:** Shows a good understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance and combines this with an awareness of the historical context to provide a balanced argument on their value for the particular purpose given in the question. Judgements may, however, be partial or limited in substantiation. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **19-24**
- L3:** Shows some understanding of all three sources in relation to both content and provenance together with some awareness of the historical context. There may, however, be some imbalance in the degree of breadth and depth of comment offered on all three sources and the analysis may not be fully convincing. The answer will make some attempt to consider the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **13-18**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. It may, for example, provide some comment on the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question but only address one or two of the sources, or focus exclusively on content (or provenance), or it may consider all three sources but fail to address the value of the sources for the particular purpose given in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **7-12**
- L1:** The answer will offer some comment on the value of at least one source in relation to the purpose given in the question but the response will be limited and may be partially inaccurate. Comments are likely to be unsupported, vague or generalist. 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 deploy knowledge of the historical context to show an understanding of the relationship between the sources and the issues raised in the question, when assessing the significance of provenance, the arguments deployed in the sources and the tone and emphasis of the sources. Descriptive answers which fail to do this should be awarded no more than Level 2 at best. Answers should address both the value and the limitations of the sources for the particular question and purpose given.

Source A: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Edward Banfield was a political scientist who had taught at the University of Chicago and Harvard, he was Republican in his political leaning as shown by his work with the Ford and Reagan presidencies
- Edward Banfield was giving his opinion in 1973, five years into a Nixon Presidency having played a role as an adviser to Nixon himself. His tone is dismissive of the Great Society and there is a clear effort to explain away the success in reducing poverty.

Content and argument

- Banfield admits that ‘The number of the poor did decline by a quarter between 1965 and 1970.’ a statistic that is backed up elsewhere and he agrees that some of this was due to the Great Society
- However, Banfield argues that ‘the Social Security program established by the New Deal accounted for more’ claiming that the Great Society was either building on FDR’s successes or defenders of the Great Society were claiming Roosevelt’s successes as their own
- Banfield argues that poverty is not reduced by higher taxation or ‘the good intentions of legislators’ which concurs with his Republican political beliefs and preference for minimal government intervention. This is in line with Nixon’s appeal to the ‘silent majority’ of Americans who resented subsidising the poor through higher taxes
- Banfield concludes that ‘It is reasonable to expect that by 1980 no one will be below the existing poverty line.’ suggesting that the inevitable continued improvement of the US economy would eventually eradicate poverty. This undermines Banfield’s argument as 1980 did not see the eradication of poverty in the USA.

Source B: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Lekachman was a Professor of Economics in New York and an advocate of government intervention. Nevertheless, he is highly critical of the success of the Great Society and the tone is very much one of disappointment and cynicism
- Lekachman emphasises that the Great Society was not a ‘giant step’ beyond the New Deal but is willing to admit that Johnson went as far as he could have been expected to, given that he was ‘a conservative politician in a conservative, racist country’.

Content and argument

- the evidence suggests Lekachman is wrong that the Great Society was far from a ‘genuine assault on poverty and deprivation’. From 1963 to 1970 poverty declined from 22.2% to 12.6%, the most dramatic decline over such a brief period in the century. Lekachman’s argument is therefore undermined because the article was written in 1967, barely two years after the Great Society was launched
- there is also evidence that the effect on African-Americans was dramatic, with the percentage of African-Americans living below the poverty line dropping from 55% in 1960 to 27% in 1968
- meanwhile, the argument that the nation’s income was distributed ‘even less equally than it was distributed before 1960’ is undermined by the changes to the Minimum Wage and the introduction of Medicare and Medicaid as well as a substantial increase in spending on education
- however, Lekachman is right that ‘social spending can be converted to the advantage of those who least need it’ as arts spending served to protect and enhance the arts often enjoyed by the middle and upper classes while changes to the media and investment in the transport infrastructure brought benefits for business
- Lekachman does not mention the Vietnam War directly, but clearly this had a significant impact on the ability of Johnson to launch a ‘genuine assault upon poverty and deprivation’. 1967 saw troop levels approaching 500,000 and huge costs in ordnance and transportation which had led Johnson to raise taxes in March of 1967.

Source C: in assessing the value of this source, students may refer to the following:

Provenance, tone and emphasis

- Rustin was a civil rights activist who was highly involved in the movement in the 1960s, as such, he is in favour of policies that benefit African-Americans, especially economically
- Rustin stressed the successes achieved by African-Americans but emphasises that this ‘substantial progress’ has been made by blacks with the help of the Great Society, rather than solely because of it. Rustin is disappointed with the weaknesses of the Great Society and seems to regret that it did not achieve more.

Content and argument

- Rustin argues that the principal weakness of the Great Society was under-funding. This agrees with the view of Sargent Shriver, the architect of the Great Society, who argued that it was ruined by the cost of the Vietnam War, an issue that King also repeatedly stressed. \$15.5 billion was spent on the Great Society between 1965 and 1973 compared to \$120 billion on Vietnam
- Rustin also agrees with King in his suggestion that one of the weaknesses of the Great Society was that it tried to deal with political powerlessness of African-Americans rather than targeting the ‘economic roots of inequality’
- Rustin argues that the ‘emphasis on providing services’ was short-sighted. Acts such as the Medical Care Act, Housing Act and Elementary and Secondary Education Act sought to address the symptoms of black exclusion rather than the cause which could have been dealt with by ‘a guaranteed annual income for the poor’
- Rustin fails to give appropriate credit for the many aspects of the services that did help the poor, for example by 1976 Medicare and Medicaid provided over 20% of the population with healthcare.

Section B

- 02** ‘The success of the civil rights movement in the years 1947 to 1957 was dependent on the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People].’

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/factors suggesting the success of the civil rights movement in the years 1947 to 1957 was dependent on the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] might include:

- the NAACP won a series of court cases between 1947 and 1957 including *Shelley v Kraemer* (1948), *Sweatt v Painter* and *McLaurin v Oklahoma* (1950) and *Brown v Board of Education* (1954), which undermined the legal basis for segregation
- in 1947, Truman became the first President to address the NAACP suggesting it had presidential attention
- Rosa Parks was secretary of the Montgomery chapter of the NAACP and had attended training courses on passive resistance. She was chosen by the Montgomery NAACP to challenge bus laws in Montgomery in the courts, the action which ignited the Bus Boycott
- following the 1954 *Brown* decision, the NAACP attempted to register black students in white schools across the South. It was the action of Little Rock NAACP member, Daisy Bates, which prompted the Little Rock Crisis of 1957.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the success of the civil rights movement in the years 1947 to 1957 was dependent on the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] might include:

- Truman commissioned the 'To Secure these Rights' report in 1947 which advocated reforms to education, housing, and voting and desegregated the army in 1948
- in 1947, CORE had embarked on the first 'Journey of Reconciliation' which inspired the later Freedom Rides and brought media attention to the movement
- Eisenhower passed the first Civil Rights Act since Reconstruction in 1957, he also intervened at Little Rock in 1957 on the side of the Supreme Court decision, establishing a key precedent
- it was Martin Luther King, through the Montgomery Bus Boycott, that pushed the Civil Rights Movement forward most significantly in the period by gaining media attention and creating a moral imperative for civil rights.

Students are likely to conclude that the NAACP was vital in challenging the legal basis for segregation and were a key group more widely, but that they could not have done this without other factors such as the attention of both Eisenhower and Truman and the support of the Supreme Court. Students may challenge the premise of the question and argue that the movement wasn't successful in these years and this is a valid approach.

- 03** ‘Eisenhower’s foreign policy in Europe differed significantly from his foreign policy elsewhere in the world.’

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/factors suggesting Eisenhower’s foreign policy in Europe differed significantly from his foreign policy elsewhere in the world might include:

- under Eisenhower the CIA were involved extensively in regime change outside of Europe, with a coup in Iran in 1953 and in Guatemala in 1954; regime change was not a feature of policy in Europe
- Eisenhower continued to fund European reconstruction through the Mutual Security Plan (the 1951 continuation of Truman’s Marshall Plan) throughout the 1950s, this financial support was greater than that given to any other continent
- Eisenhower wanted Britain and France to be strong within Europe but was unwilling to support their imperial ambitions at Suez in 1956
- Eisenhower was willing to meet with Khrushchev to discuss Berlin in 1959 but developments in Vietnam and Cuba were ignored.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that Eisenhower’s foreign policy in Europe differed significantly from his foreign policy elsewhere in the world might include:

- Eisenhower’s principal focus was peace, he ended the war in Korea and avoided being entangled in Vietnam, in Europe he similarly avoided becoming involved in Hungary in 1956
- Eisenhower sought to build alliances in both Europe and Asia, expanding the role of NATO and creating SEATO through the Manila Pact in 1954 and CENTO in the Middle East in 1955
- the 1957 ‘Eisenhower Doctrine’, which committed the USA to assist any nation requesting assistance against armed aggression from any country controlled by international Communism, suggested a global policy rather than a continent specific one.
- Eisenhower’s approach to Chinese aggression against Taiwan, through the 1955 Formosa Resolution, had clear parallels with the long-standing approach to communist aggression against European countries.

Students might argue either interpretation or conclude that Eisenhower’s foreign policy was not dictated by regions but by personalities or events, for instance his attempts to build bridges with Khrushchev and then the decline of their relations or his stated policy of ‘massive retaliation’, in terms of Europe versus the rest of the world. However, it was clear that Soviet domination of Eastern Europe was more established than their influence elsewhere and this could be said to have dictated a different approach.

- 04** To what extent were the presidencies of Ford and Carter disastrous for the USA at home and abroad? **[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/factors suggesting that the presidencies of Ford and Carter were disastrous for the USA at home and abroad might include:

- accusations of corruption dogged both Presidents. Ford was tainted by his pardoning of Nixon and Carter's honeymoon period with the press was over quickly with stories about corruption in his Executive and family, proliferating in a press emboldened by its success with Watergate
- the economy suffered under both Presidents. Ford's presidency began with a recession, unemployment increased and in 1979 and 1980 inflation topped 11%. Carter was badly affected by the energy crisis and forced to address the nation on the issue of the economic 'malaise'
- the US looked powerless when the USSR invaded Afghanistan in 1979 and Carter's handling of the 1980 Iran hostages crisis made the US appear weak on the world stage. Ford's status in foreign policy was damaged by the drawn out end of the Vietnam War
- Carter's defeat of Ford, despite being a relative unknown, suggests that the electorate were disappointed by the Ford presidency
- Reagan's crushing defeat of Carter by over 8 million votes suggests Carter's presidency was seen as a disaster.

Arguments/factors challenging the view that the presidencies of Ford and Carter were disastrous for the USA at home and abroad might include:

- Ford successfully extricated the US from the debilitating Vietnam War and began the process of national healing. Neither President involved US forces in large scale conflict
- Carter brought a measure of stability to the Middle East with the Camp David Accords, returned the Panama Canal to Panama, and embarked on a second round of Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT II)
- both Ford and Carter presided over a period of relative social stability following the convulsions of the Civil Rights Movement and the Vietnam War protests. In this environment African-Americans began to take advantage of the gains won in the 1960s
- both Ford and Carter passed legislation that had a positive effect on women's position in the US with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Ford) and the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (Carter) being key advances.

Students might conclude that Ford was tainted by the legacy of Nixon and Vietnam, whereas Carter had some achievements, but these were less visible than both his failures, such as over Iran, and the events that occurred in his Presidency such as the Three Mile Island disaster and the oil crisis.