



**General Certificate of Education
January 2013**

AS History 1041

HIS2Q

Unit 2Q

The USA and Vietnam, 1961–1975

Final

Mark Scheme

Mark schemes are prepared by the Principal Examiner 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 examiners 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 examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each examiner 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, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Principal Examiner.

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 to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to schools/colleges to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how students have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Students who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Students who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Students who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which students meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a student performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:**AS EXAMINATION PAPERS****General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)**

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that students might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other students' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Students should never be doubly penalised. If a student with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a student with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

January 2013

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2Q: The USA and Vietnam, 1961–1975

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the USA's involvement in South Vietnam in 1963. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4:	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

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 levels scheme.

Students will need to identify differences between the views of the two sources. For example:

- Source B refers to the USA having a military role in the Mekong Delta. Source A refers to withdrawal deadlines. There is a clear difference between the sources in terms of withdrawal and the continuance of the US military presence
- Source B refers to test criteria as the basis for all US decision making in terms of Vietnam. Source A refers to a long term program for US decision making which is already in place. The decisions are already made in A whilst in B the process is much more open-ended and responsive to changing situations.

Students will need to apply their own knowledge of context to explain these differences. They might, for example, refer to:

- Kennedy had not established a final strategy towards Vietnam. He was committed to containment but not necessarily in its full military form
- there was uncertainty in the US that the South Vietnamese were in a strong position militarily and politically. There was the possibility that stronger political leadership could have moved the USA towards gradual withdrawal. These sources come very soon before and after the assassination of Diem.

To address 'how far', students should also indicate some similarity between the sources. For example:

- both sources are committed to preparing the South Vietnamese to make a major contribution towards their own defences against communism. Source B refers to assisting the 'people and government of that country to win their contest against the... communist conspiracy'. Source A refers to 'train progressively the Vietnamese to take over military functions'
- both sources suggest that the USA is committed to not doing anything that might damage the war effort. This is explicit in Source A and referred to in Source B through the second sentence in the source. This commits the US to decision-making aimed at ensuring policies that do not undermine the effectiveness of frustrating the defence against the 'communist conspiracy'.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that US policy shifted soon after Kennedy's assassination. The Kennedy legacy seemed to favour planned withdrawal of military forces, while the post-Kennedy position was more cautious and less focussed on gradual withdrawal. This reflects the rather imprecise nature of US policy in late 1963, as no clearly finalised strategy had been established.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important to the USA was the protection of South Vietnam from the threat posed by communism by 1963? (24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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 be able to make a judgement by addressing the focus of the question and offering some balance of other factors or views. In 'how important' and 'how successful questions', the answer could be (but does not need to be) exclusively based on the focus of the question.

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** suggests a degree of unpreparedness on the part of the South Vietnamese. The USA could not really consider final military withdrawal for at least two years i.e. 1965. The importance of training the South Vietnamese over such an extended period highlights the scale of the threat posed by the communists.
- **Source B:** the communist threat is seen as a 'conspiracy' by the USA. This amplifies the complexity of the threat. The source also refers to 'this area'. Some students may take this to mean the wider geographic area of SE Asia.
- **Source C:** the later view is explicitly developed in this source. The protection of Vietnam was integral to the regional and global interests of the USA. This source fully develops the importance of Vietnam in terms of US vital national interests and this is made particularly clear in the final sentence.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the protection of South Vietnam from the threat of communism was important to the USA might include:

- Kennedy was committed to containment. Vietnam was an obvious test of containment. If containment was to remain the foundation of US Cold War thinking, which it was, then it had to be applied in Vietnam.
- the communists had already made in-roads in Cuba. Although not a defeat for the USA, the Cuba crisis reaffirmed the view that communism was expansionist. Its expansion had to be halted in SE Asia in general and Vietnam in particular.
- Kennedy presented himself as the defender of democracy. Defending it in Vietnam was totally consistent with this position.

Factors suggesting the threat posed by communism to South Vietnam was not important to the US might include:

- Kennedy was clearly considering military withdrawal. If Vietnam was important would this strategy make sense?
- Sino-Soviet relations were at an all-time low. The communist world was not united and there was no clear indication that it would collectively rise to aid the communist threat from North Vietnam.
- Kennedy had never committed large scale ground forces to South Vietnam. The US military presence was always relatively limited both in terms of numbers and the role it played.

Good answers may conclude that containing any threat from the communist system was important to the USA. However, by 1963 the USA was not convinced that it needed to adopt a direct role. Containment could be delivered by proxy i.e. the South Vietnamese could defend themselves with US support.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why President Johnson supported the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in August 1964.
(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why President Johnson supported the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Johnson was committed to the belief that USS Maddox and the USS Turner Joy had been attacked by the North Vietnamese. In effect this meant that he almost had no option other than to support the Resolution in defence of US national interests
- the Resolution gave Johnson a blank cheque to manage the crisis in Vietnam as he wished. This was an opportunity that he could not ignore
- there was popular support for US intervention and Johnson knew this. Failing to back the Resolution would have undermined Johnson politically
- Johnson was urged on by his political and security advisers, particularly McNamara.

OR Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- Johnson was committed to Kennedy's legacy in Vietnam and to containment as the strategy to protect the USA's vital national interests. The Resolution enabled him to fulfil both these objectives without Congressional interference.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- as the political campaign for the Presidency heightened, Johnson's Presidential opponent, Barry Goldwater, had been accusing Johnson of being 'soft on Communism'. The Resolution would enable Johnson to show that he wasn't. It offered Johnson a political tool to strengthen his Presidential campaign against the Republicans
- some historians argue that Johnson and his team deliberately manufactured the incident in order to convince Congress that such a Resolution was necessary. Once it was created, Johnson's objective had been achieved.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might suggest that Johnson had his own political agenda that the Resolution neatly accommodated. He was not necessarily intending to escalate the war but he was determined to emerge as the victor from it. The Resolution appeared to facilitate these different, but connected, aims.

Question 2

- 04** 'In the years 1965 to 1968, the war in Vietnam escalated because President Johnson was confident of a US military victory.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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 be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence which supports the view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- Johnson arrogantly concluded that the economic and military might of the USA could easily overwhelm any threat from the North Vietnamese
- his strategy was to use US military power to force a diplomatic solution, with the USA in the driving seat as far as diplomatic outcomes were concerned
- the bombing campaign illustrates Johnson's certainty that excessive military power would succeed
- Johnson wanted to believe that a military victory was certainly achievable because it would be politically advantageous for him.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- the fact that rapid escalation took place illustrates Johnson's anxiety that a military victory was not guaranteed. Escalation was necessary to achieve what was becoming increasingly unachievable
- Johnson showed an interest in a diplomatic solution. This may suggest that certainty in a purely military victory was not absolute but escalation would re-emphasise the military power of the USA prior to diplomacy
- growing popular protest unnerved Johnson. He had to continue to escalate in order to find a way to defuse such protest through military success.

Good answers may conclude that initially Johnson was convinced that escalation would lead to a military victory but later escalation became a form of crisis management for Johnson.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Tet Offensive of 1968 was a setback for the USA. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why the Tet Offensive may be regarded as a setback for the USA.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the Offensive had a profoundly damaging impact psychologically on the USA. Its confidence in its war effort was fundamentally undermined
- the morale of US troops was seriously undermined. This was particularly evident through the impact of the prolonged siege at Khe Sanh
- even though the VC had suffered major losses, the fact that a largely guerrilla force could carry out such a widespread attack on apparently secure US military installations suggested that the war was unwinnable militarily. The Offensive raised major questions about the ability of the USA to defeat what they had traditionally seen as an inferior military opponent.

OR Students may refer to some of the following long-term factors:

- the USA now realised that containment was not working. This necessitated a fundamental review of how US national interests could be protected. Tet had triggered an urgent shift in US thinking; one that it was not fully prepared for.

and some of the following short-term/immediate factors:

- President Johnson decided not to stand for re-election. To this extent the Tet Offensive had a directly negative impact on internal/domestic politics in the USA.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might suggest that the real outcome of the Offensive was a defeat for the USA despite its apparent military success for them. They may argue that the collapse of morale at ground level was matched by a similar collapse amongst the leadership. This necessitated some form of U-turn which the Americans had not been expecting to make and were unprepared for.

Question 3

- 06** 'In the years 1969 to 1973, President Nixon always favoured a diplomatic solution to the war in Vietnam.'

Explain why you agree or disagree with this view.

(24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

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 be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that the primary focus Nixon had was on how to achieve a successful outcome from Vietnam for the USA by diplomatic rather than any other means.

Points/factors/evidence which agree(s) might include:

- he introduced Vietnamisation. This may be seen as a conciliatory measure designed to suggest to the North Vietnamese that the USA was not an imperialist or invading power seeking to preserve a division between the North and the South. This may be part of a process of 'softening up' the North Vietnamese and preparing them for a diplomatic solution
- Nixon presented the bombing campaigns as a form of military pressure designed to facilitate, diplomatic route designed to enable US withdrawal and 'peace with honour'
- Nixon promoted détente. This wider contextual process suggests that military containment was now redundant and a diplomatic route to the protection of US vital national interests was now the way forward
- Nixon embarked on diplomacy and this led to the Paris Peace agreements of 1973. The war ended through a diplomatic solution.

Points/factors/evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- Nixon even referred to himself as a 'mad bomber'. Nixon was still hedging his bets and committed to militarism as a primary route to the 'peace with honour' target. Nixon wanted to achieve this by whatever means possible and that included escalating militarism
- students may question the diplomatic links with the invasion of Cambodia and Laos. These were blatant acts of aggression and an expansion of the war. How could Nixon have seen such acts as a means to facilitate or trigger diplomatic cooperation from North Vietnam?
- Nixon continued to use military action despite anti-war pressure in the USA. Greater commitment to a peaceful and diplomatic solution would have calmed popular protest. The protest continued because many people were not convinced on Nixon's sincerity and genuine commitment to a diplomatic rather than a military solution.

Good answers may conclude that even Nixon came to accept that militarism would not succeed. Students may argue that this realisation dawned on him as early as 1968, after the Tet Offensive. Nixon was always driven by his own political agenda as well as the issues specific to Vietnam. Militarism served its purpose but it was not necessarily the primary objective in itself. The wider contextual detail linked to the emergence of détente may be used effectively to illustrate that Nixon was in a new decade of diplomacy and this was the recognised route to protect US interests. The militarism was a secondary issue in this more fundamental process. Militarism was an addition and a distraction more than anything else.

Converting marks into UMS marks

Convert raw marks into marks on the Uniform Mark Scale (UMS) by using the link below.

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion