5.8 Civil Rights in the United States: Race, Gender and LGBT+ Rights: 30-minute Pack

EDEXCEL 9PL0 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions. Short answer questions may be brief. For levels-marked questions, write a fully developed essay using precise legal and political vocabulary, named cases and dates where relevant. The final question is a 30-mark evaluation and requires a clear judgement.

1 Explain how the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment has shaped protections against racial discrimination, citing at least one key case besides Brown v Board of Education.

(Total for Question 1 is 6 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

2 Evaluate the extent to which civil rights are effectively protected in the United States today, focusing on race, gender and LGBT+ rights, and drawing on constitutional provisions, key Supreme Court rulings and the role of social movements. Your answer should reach a clear judgement.

(Total for Question 2 is 30 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 5.8 Civil Rights in the United States: Race, Gender and LGBT+ Rights: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

Level 0 No relevant content. **0**

Level 1 Basic, limited knowledge of the Fourteenth Amendment's role with minimal or no case detail. **1-2**

Level 2 Clear explanation of how the Fourteenth Amendment has been used to combat racial discrimination with one accurate case example and limited development. **3-4**

Level 3 Detailed explanation using at least one well-chosen case, e.g. Loving v Virginia, showing how the Court applied equal protection principles to limit state racial discrimination and the wider implications. **5-6**

Indicative content:

- The Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause provided the constitutional basis for challenging state-imposed racial segregation and discrimination.
- Loving v Virginia (1967) is a key case where the Supreme Court struck down state antimiscegenation laws banning interracial marriage under the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses.
- The Court has applied varying levels of scrutiny in equal protection cases: strict scrutiny for laws discriminating on the basis of race, making it difficult for states to justify such laws.
- The Court's rulings transformed state practices by making explicit that state racial classifications must meet the highest justification standard, contributing to dismantling legally sanctioned racial barriers across many policy areas.

Question 2

Level 0 No relevant content. **0**

Level 1 Basic, limited knowledge of civil rights with little or no developed analysis or evaluation. Examples, if present, are generalised or inaccurate. **1-7**

Level 2 Clear, mostly accurate knowledge of constitutional provisions, relevant cases and social movements with some developed analysis; evaluation is present but may be one-sided or only partially supported by evidence. **8-15**

Level 3 Detailed, accurate knowledge deployed in a sustained analysis engaging with protections for race, gender and LGBT+ rights, using well-selected examples and showing balanced evaluation that weighs strengths and weaknesses, leading toward a supported judgement. **16-23**

Level 4 Sophisticated, wide-ranging and accurate knowledge used to construct a tightly argued evaluation directly comparing protections across the three areas, integrating constitutional text, Supreme Court doctrine, legislative variation and social movement influence, and reaching a clearly substantiated, nuanced judgement on the overall effectiveness of civil rights protection today. **24-30**

Indicative content:

- Arguments that protections are effective: the Fourteenth Amendment's Equal Protection Clause remains a powerful constitutional tool; landmark rulings such as Brown v Board (1954), Loving v Virginia (1967) and Obergefell v Hodges (2015) show the Court can extend and protect rights.
- Arguments that protections are limited or uneven: recent Supreme Court decisions, notably Dobbs v Jackson Womens Health Organization (2022), show rights protections can be rolled back; the Court's composition and doctrinal shifts have produced uncertainty for rights based on substantive due process or privacy.
- Legal limits and federalism: many protections depend on federal judicial interpretation and are subject to political change, while state-by-state variation (especially after Dobbs) produces unequal protection of rights across the country.
- Race-specific concerns: despite constitutional rulings, structural racism, disparities in criminal justice, voting access disputes and resistance to some forms of affirmative action show limits to effective protection in practice.
- Gender and reproductive rights: Dobbs returned abortion regulation to the states, producing a patchwork of access and showing the fragility of rights not explicitly grounded in a clear constitutional text.
- LGBT+ rights: Obergefell advanced marriage equality nationwide, but the durability of other LGBT+ protections (e.g. employment, public accommodation) can depend on statutory law and future Court rulings, producing ongoing vulnerability.
- Role of social movements: movements remain crucial for agenda setting, litigation support and legislative change, illustrated by civil rights movement successes, LGBT+ advocacy leading to marriage equality, and contemporary mobilisations around reproductive rights.
- Political and institutional constraints: Congressional gridlock, variable state legislatures, and the role of the Supreme Court in altering doctrine mean legal protections can be incomplete and politically contested.
- A strong conclusion recognises unevenness: significant constitutional and judicial protections exist and have transformed rights, but protections are not consistently effective across all groups or issues, and remain vulnerable to political and judicial shifts; the best judgement is that protections are substantial in some areas but fragile and unequal overall.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk