
AS

History

The American Dream: reality and illusion, 1945–1980

Component 2Q Prosperity, inequality and Superpower status, 1945–1963

Mark scheme

7041

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

The American Dream: reality and illusion, 1945–1980

AS History Component 2Q Prosperity, inequality and Superpower status, 1945–1963

Section A

- 01** With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context, which of these two sources is more valuable in explaining relations between Cuba and the USA in the years 1960/61? **[25 marks]**

Target: AO2

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

Generic Mark Scheme

- L5:** Answers will display a very good understanding of the value of the sources in relation to the issue identified in the question. They will evaluate the sources thoroughly in order to provide a well-substantiated conclusion. The response demonstrates a very good understanding of context. **21-25**
- L4:** Answers will provide a range of relevant well-supported comments on the value of the sources for the issue identified in the question. There will be sufficient comment to provide a supported conclusion but not all comments will be well-substantiated, and judgements will be limited. The response demonstrates a good understanding of context. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will provide some relevant comments on the value of the sources and there will be some explicit reference to the issue identified in the question. Judgements will however, be partial and/or thinly supported. The response demonstrates an understanding of context. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be partial. There may be either some relevant comments on the value of one source in relation to the issue identified in the question or some comment on both, but lacking depth and have little, if any, explicit link to the issue identified in the question. The response demonstrates some understanding of context. **6-10**
- L1:** The answer will either describe source content or offer stock phrases about the value of the source. There may be some comment on the issue identified in the question but it is likely to be limited, unsubstantiated and unconvincing. The response demonstrates limited understanding of context. **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.

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.

In responding to this question, students may choose to address each source in turn or to adopt a more comparative approach in order to arrive at a judgement. Either approach is equally valid and what follows is indicative of the evaluation which may be relevant.

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

Provenance and tone

- Castro is addressing the UN in September 1960, over eighteen months after he became leader of Cuba but before the US began its embargo on trade with Cuba
- the tone is aggressive, suggesting that the US had made Cuba into a colony and exploited the island for its economic value in an unfair way. Castro was seeking to embarrass the US on their own soil.

Content and argument

- Castro is addressing the UN in September 1960, during a trip in which he met Khrushchev and they both condemned poverty and racism, adopting an antagonistic attitude towards the USA
- Castro is suggesting that the US had behaved no better towards Cuba than the Spanish had and that Batista had allowed US businesses to take control of Cuban infrastructure and exploit the island economically and that this justified moving away from the US
- at this stage Castro did not refer to himself as a Communist but had begun to implement Socialist policies which angered the US, such as reforming land ownership in favour of the peasants and nationalising the oil and sugar industries
- Castro had also done a deal with the USSR to provide sugar and other raw materials in return for crude oil, industrial goods and weapons in addition to a \$100 million loan. He is highlighting the economic exploitation of Cuba by the US in the extract to justify these moves.

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

Provenance and tone

- the extract is taken from a private letter sent to Khrushchev during the Bay of Pigs invasion which was a 'military intervention' sponsored by the US. He makes no reference to the action by the Cuban exiles which the USA is supporting

- Kennedy is stressing US support for democracy in Cuba directly to Khrushchev rather than through a reported speech. He is also issuing a veiled threat about potential US intervention in Cuba and attempting to show he is willing to be tough while reiterating that he intends no 'military intervention'.

Content and argument

- this is a private letter and Kennedy is trying to distance himself from the invasion. At this point the Bay of Pigs attack was in its second day, the initial landing having been unsuccessful with the exiles brigade having been dispersed by Castro's militia
- in the line, 'In the event of any military intervention by outside force we will immediately honor our obligations to protect this hemisphere against external aggression.', Kennedy is referring to the 1823 Monroe Doctrine which stated that the US would view any effort by a European power to expand its influence in North or South America as an act of aggression
- tension between the superpowers already existed over the situation in Laos and in Berlin. Tentative plans were in place for Kennedy to meet with Khrushchev which eventually led to the Vienna Summit of 1961 and Kennedy was seeking to set out his foreign policy agenda of supporting 'the spirit of liberty' and asserting that he would be a strong President
- Kennedy is arguing that the Cuban people were in a 'struggle for freedom' against Castro and that they found 'intolerable the denial of democratic liberties'. Although there was some anti-Castro sentiment this was mostly from those who had benefited from the Batista regime, the broader peasant population were pleased with the increased spending on infrastructure and services that had followed Castro's accession to power.

A conclusion which indicates which source may be of greater value, with reason to support this, accepting that any supported argument will be fully rewarded. A student may argue that Castro's speech provides clear reasoning for his policy of removing US influence in Cuba whereas Kennedy's letter is only useful by inferring from his lack of reference to the Bay of Pigs attack.

Section B

- 02** 'The Federal Government successfully dealt with the change from a wartime to a peacetime economy in the years 1945 to 1952.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that the Federal Government successfully dealt with the change from a wartime to a peacetime economy in the years 1945 to 1952 might include:

- the government invested over \$20 billion, in the years after 1945, in the GI Bill which stimulated house building and led to a significant growth in the higher education sector producing a more qualified workforce
- Truman's decision to demobilise the army gradually ensured there was not mass unemployment following the end of the war, indeed unemployment never rose higher than 5% under his presidency
- the use of Marshal Aid and the creation of the Bretton-Woods system ensured that the international economy was conducive towards US economic success and created a market for US goods
- employment grew from 46 million to 61 million under Truman and the per capita income of Americans rose 40%.

Arguments challenging the view that the Federal Government successfully dealt with the change from a wartime to a peacetime economy in the years 1945 to 1952 might include:

- Truman's lack of popularity (he only had a 22% approval rate in 1952) suggests that his economic policies were unsuccessful
- the US inflation rate hit 25% in the first year after the war
- it was the baby boom rather than the Federal Government that prompted economic growth in the seven years after the war stimulating demand for housing, automobiles and consumer goods
- Truman lacked the political capital of Roosevelt, as shown by his failure to persuade Congress to pass the 1946 Price Control Bill, and his big ideas, such as the Fair Deal or Price Control Bill, were often watered down or blocked by Congress. This meant that the Federal Government had a limited impact on the transition.

Students are likely to conclude that the US economy did recover effectively from the end of the war but that this was not entirely down to the actions of the Federal Government. More significant was the damage to the rest of the world's economy and the rapid conversion of US factories from making military equipment to consumer goods.

- 03** 'Eisenhower failed to show strong leadership in his dealings with communist countries in the years 1953 to 1960.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with 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 good understanding of the demands of the question. They 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 leading to substantiated judgement. **21-25**
- L4:** 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. The answer will be effectively organised and show adequate communication skills. There will be analytical comment in relation to the question and the answer will display some balance. However, there may be some generalisation and judgements will be limited and only partially substantiated. **16-20**
- L3:** The answer will show some understanding of the full demands of the question and the answer will be adequately organised. There will be appropriate information showing an understanding of some key features and/or issues but the answer may be limited in scope and/or contain inaccuracy and irrelevance. There will be some comment in relation to the question. **11-15**
- L2:** The answer will be 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 suggesting that Eisenhower failed to show strong leadership in his dealings with communist countries in the years 1953 to 1960 might include:

- Eisenhower's failure to act over the Hungarian invasion of 1956 suggested that the Truman Doctrine would not apply to countries already dominated by the USSR
- the U2 crisis in May 1960 also undermined the US's position. Eisenhower admitted authorising the spying missions calling them a 'distasteful necessity'
- Eisenhower ended the war in Korea with an armistice rather than a decisive victory, suggesting that US support for anti-communist movements worldwide had limits and that he was unwilling to challenge Chinese influence in East Asia.

Arguments challenging the view that Eisenhower failed to show strong leadership in his dealings with communist countries in the years 1953 to 1960 might include:

- Eisenhower was willing to negotiate with Khrushchev but stood up to him over key issues, such as Khrushchev's demand that western forces be pulled out of Berlin or the U2 incident
- Eisenhower and Dulles built on the establishment of NATO by creating both SEATO and CENTO which attempted to unite US allies and protect countries from a 'domino effect'
- Eisenhower built up the US nuclear stockpile to over 5500 weapons by 1957, compared to a Soviet total of 650, this ensured that the US was in a position to respond to Soviet aggression and to defend their allies
- Eisenhower authorised military aid to support the French in Vietnam and even contemplated tactical nuclear strikes to prevent a Viet Minh victory. After the French surrender, his administration supported the often brutal anti-communist leader Ngo Dinh Diem in South Vietnam.

Students are likely to conclude that Eisenhower successfully avoided conflict and stood up to the USSR several times but failed to prevent communists consolidating power elsewhere, notably in North Korea, Hungary and Vietnam.