

---

# A-level **HISTORY**

Paper 2Q The American Dream: Reality and Illusion, 1945–1980

---

**Mark scheme**

---

---

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](http://aqa.org.uk)

## A-level History Paper 2 Specimen Mark Scheme

### 2Q The American Dream: Reality and Illusion, 1945–1980

#### Section A

- |          |          |   |                   |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|
| <b>0</b> | <b>1</b> | With reference to these sources and your understanding of the historical context assess the value of these three sources to an historian studying the escalation of the US war effort in Vietnam in the years 1964 to 1968. | <b>[30 marks]</b> |
|----------|----------|---|-------------------|

*Target: AO2*

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

#### Generic Mark Scheme

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.   | <b>25-30</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>19-24</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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. | <b>13-18</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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), <b>or</b> 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.   | <b>7-12</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.   | <b>1-6</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

## 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 should analyse and evaluate these sources and assess their usefulness as evidence about the escalation of the US involvement in Vietnam under President Johnson. Answers may choose to deal with each source in turn; or to make a comparative evaluation, linking the sources together. Either approach is valid.

### Source A:

In assessing the value of this source, students may refer to some of the following:

#### Provenance

- the source is from a confidential, 'in-house' report, outlining the reasons why the US should consider taking action to stabilise the situation of South Vietnam
- it is based on expert evidence from well-informed advisers.

#### Content and argument

- the report sets out a comprehensive list of issues and choices to be considered by policymakers. Both general strategic factors and specific tactical considerations are outlined
- answers may comment on the arguments put forward in the light of their contextual understanding of the pressures on US policy in 1964.

#### Tone and emphasis

- although factual and objective in style, the report is intended to persuade. The implications are spelled out in such a way as to suggest *not* taking action would be a serious error
- the reference to 'Red plans' reflects basic anti-Communist assumptions.

### Source B:

In assessing the usefulness of this source, students may refer to some of the following:

#### Provenance

- like Source A, this is a confidential, 'in-house' source, from a highly-placed and well-informed expert
- some answers may use contextual understanding of the personalities alongside McGeorge Bundy in the 'team' advising Johnson (such as Robert MacNamara).

#### Content and argument

- the source reveals the complex balance of choices facing Johnson and his advisers. It sets out the reasons in favour of reprisals against North Vietnam but also indicates clearly the heavy costs and possible adverse consequences; it even faces up to the

- possibility that the policy may end in failure
- the argument is not only about the military situation in Vietnam but also considers the impact on domestic politics.

**Tone and emphasis**

- the tone is sober and serious. It is very much for private consumption only and this is reflected in the tone of pessimism and uncertainty.

**Source C:**

In assessing usefulness students may refer to some of the following:

**Provenance**

- the source is from a speech broadcast on national television. President Johnson is very aware of his audience as ‘my Fellow Americans’ – this is a bi-partisan speech to the whole nation, not a party political one
- the speech is not spontaneous or part of a debate; it is carefully prepared, written with the help of numerous speech-writers, having attempted to consider all aspects.

**Content and argument**

- the ‘domino theory’, the wider context of the Cold War and the position of the US as a world power, is highlighted. The issue is not just Vietnam
- Johnson goes out of his way to remind his audience that the situation in South East Asia is not just down to him. It is a situation he inherited from his three predecessors as president
- Johnson puts great weight on the moral responsibility of the US towards the people of South Vietnam.

**Tone and emphasis**

- the tone is earnest, reflecting the seriousness of the news being announced
- there is a thread of defensiveness running through the speech, underlining the necessity of the situation overriding Johnson’s reluctance
- there is a tone of anti-Communism, as in the phrase ‘grasping ambition of Asian Communism’.

In summary, these sources do set out a range of views, showing the diverse calculations that led to its formulation of US policy in Vietnam. Students may see the three sources as complementary, as the culmination of a process of confidential discussions that can be traced from Source A in November 1964, through Source B in February 1965, to the public announcement of (and justification of) US policy by the President in July. Some answers will have an integrated approach, reaching an overall evaluation by making links and connections and differentiated assessments.

**Section B**

**0 2** 'It was a time of abundant prosperity and unquestioning national self-confidence.'

Assess the validity of this view of the United States in the years 1945 to 1960.

**[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.**

Students should address the core issue of the extent of ‘national self-confidence’ and well-being within the United States after the Second World War.

In doing so they may present arguments that strongly support the key quotation:

- for most Americans, the United States did indeed ‘have a good war’. Where other countries, both winners and losers, emerged from the war with shattered economies and heavily scarred by the war, the United States remained free from bombing or invasion and actually enjoyed full employment and a consumer boom. Post-war prosperity was in sharp contrast to the Depression years of the 1930s
- the expansion of the economy was reflected in great increases in living standards – in ownership of houses, cars, televisions and consumer durables
- national self-confidence was not only underpinned by prosperity but also by an atmosphere of success and national power. The United States was now clearly the strongest power in the world. Most Americans enjoyed the feelings of national pride and its reflection in the media and popular entertainment
- on the surface at least, the war seemed to have produced a strong sense of national unity – divisions between Democrats and Republicans seemed to be reduced
- the tone and style of the Eisenhower presidency emphasised this sense of national harmony; helped by Eisenhower’s emollient personality and his status as a war-hero.

Arguments in the opposite direction, challenging the key quotation, might include:

- the sense of confidence and well-being in the United States was all on the surface. Underneath, there serious anxieties and deep divisions
- little had been done to address the problems of segregation and discrimination against African-Americans. The experiences of serving in the war had, (as with the First World War) raised awareness and expectations of Black servicemen but both Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman had remained ‘prisoners’ of the politics of Southern Democrats. Throughout the 1950s, the question of civil rights was a festering one
- from 1947, the Cold War produced tensions and dangers. The acquisition of nuclear weapons by the USSR and rise of Communist China dramatised these dangers
- McCarthyism was a source of bitter controversies. From 1949 to 1954, it could be said that McCarthyism ‘poisoned the well’ of American politics. McCarthyism also caused lasting divisions in Hollywood and the media
- there was a growing ‘generation gap’ and pressure to alter the status of women. Many of the social divisions of the 1960s were already present in the 1950s, even if not yet obvious
- the impact of JFK in the 1960 election reflected this unease.

<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	'In the years 1961 to 1968, the campaigns to advance the civil rights of African-Americans made only limited progress in the face of bitter opposition.'
----------	----------	--

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

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |



---

## 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 should address how far and why there was ‘only limited progress’ in advancing the rights of African-Americans in the US in the 1960s; and how this is related to the ‘bitter opposition’.

In deploying arguments in support of the proposition, students might include:

- progress was indeed painfully slow. John F Kennedy achieved very little (and has been accused by some historians of not trying very hard). Lyndon Johnson achieved much more but was side-tracked by Vietnam and faced entrenched opposition from southern segregationists
- the implementation of civil rights in the South was halting at best
- urban rioting reflected major social divisions holding back the push towards equality; so did the experiences of African-Americans serving in Vietnam
- the murder of Martin Luther King in 1968 reflected the intense opposition to civil rights; the divisions within the civil rights leadership by 1968 also showed the deep sense of frustration at slow progress.

Students trying to challenge the key quotation might include:

- there was a huge change in public opinion in the 1960s. This was shown by the actions of and support for ‘freedom riders’ and by the changed attitudes of politicians
- changed attitudes were reflected in the media and popular culture. The South stopped being an ‘unknown country’ as people became familiar with the region through television coverage (e.g. the clashes at Selma in Alabama)
- President Johnson’s civil rights legislation was genuinely historic, the more so since it was achieved at great political cost – the Democrats ‘lost the South for a generation’ as Johnson knew they would
- ‘bitter opposition’ did indeed exist (as with George Wallace) but it was marginalised from the political mainstream. By 1968 the advance of civil rights was far from complete but it was already irreversible.

Stronger responses may show the ability to put forward differentiated assessments, for example appreciation of interrelated factors such as the presidency, the Supreme Court, the role of civil rights leaders, the media and economic change in the South.

0	4	‘Richard Nixon proved himself to be a master of statesmanship in foreign affairs.’
---	---	--

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

- |            |   |              |
|------------|---|--------------|
| <b>L5:</b> | 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.  | <b>21-25</b> |
| <b>L4:</b> | 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.   | <b>16-20</b> |
| <b>L3:</b> | 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.   | <b>11-15</b> |
| <b>L2:</b> | 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. | <b>6-10</b>  |
| <b>L1:</b> | 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.  | <b>1-5</b>   |
|            | Nothing worthy of credit.   | <b>0</b>     |

---

## 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.**

Nixon was president from his inauguration in 1969 until his resignation in disgrace in 1974 after the Watergate Scandal. Before then, he was Eisenhower's vice-president in the 1950s and remained a public figure in the 1960s, up to and including the 1968 election campaign, in which foreign affairs played a prominent role. Answers making appropriate reference to Nixon's actions in foreign policy before 1969 should be rewarded; but this is by no means a requirement. Answers focused upon Nixon's time as president will be entirely valid.

Arguments in support of the key quotation might include:

- Nixon had gained significant experience in foreign affairs as vice-president in the 1950s, at the height of the Cold War
- Nixon formed a brilliant partnership with Henry Kissinger, bringing unrivalled expertise into the formulation of US foreign policy
- after tortuous negotiations, Nixon and Kissinger did eventually succeed in ending US involvement in Vietnam
- the secret negotiations with China and the forming of a new relationship with Chinese Communist leaders was a masterpiece of diplomacy
- the fact that US foreign policy went badly wrong between 1975 and 1980 showed how badly Nixon's expertise was missed.

Against this, many answers may argue persuasively that Nixon's record in foreign affairs included many failures and was far from 'statesmanlike':

- Nixon's policy towards peace negotiations with North Vietnam was devious and unsuccessful; it can be argued he unnecessarily prolonged the war – without preventing the humiliating final collapse that occurred in 1975
- Nixon and Kissinger deceived Congress and the people when they widened the war into Laos and Cambodia. The policy was unsuccessful as well as dishonest
- US policy and actions were responsible for overthrowing the democratically elected government of Chile in 1973; this turned out very badly for both Chile and the US
- US policy was badly caught out by the war in the Middle East in 1973 and by the oil-price crisis. By the time Nixon was forced out of office in 1974, the US was facing serious difficulties in many aspects of world affairs.

Strong answers may show differentiated assessments and/or an understanding of the ways in which key personalities and geopolitical developments were interrelated.

