



**General Certificate of Education
January 2011**

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 meeting attended by all examiners and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation meeting ensures that the mark scheme covers the candidates' responses to questions and that every examiner understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for the standardisation meeting each examiner analyses a number of candidates' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed at the meeting and legislated for. If, after this meeting, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been discussed at the meeting 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 candidates' 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 © 2011 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres 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 centres 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 candidates. 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 candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates 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. Candidates 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 candidates 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 candidate 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 candidates 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 candidates' 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*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate 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 candidate 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 2011

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 media's coverage of the war in Vietnam. (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 candidates 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.

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

- Source B suggests simple factual reporting of the war without any indication of analysis or any consideration of 'the underlying purpose.' Source A suggests the media supported the war 'enthusiastically.' This implies a clear difference in the nature of the reporting content
- Source B suggests that the media dominated American public opinion while Source A notes that 'relatively few Americans relied' on television for opinion.

- Source B refers to the 'demoralisation' of the home front brought about by the nature of the reporting content but there is no reference to any collapse in the morale of the American people as a result of the war or the reporting connected to in Source A.

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

- the war in Vietnam was widely and openly reported. The US media had almost free access to the events of the war and censorship was relatively limited. It was possible for the media, particularly television, to present graphic illustrations of the nature of the fighting
- American public opinion on the war was split as the war proceeded. Opinion was not formed entirely through the impact of the media. From the outset of the war some Americans opposed it in principle. However it was the case that the scale of opposition increased as the media accurately reported the increase in US casualty levels and the impact the economic cost of the war was having on US domestic policy implementation
- the USA was divided in terms of attitudes towards the war. There were those who did view the war as a patriotic crusade in defence of freedom, while others questioned the validity of the USA's role and the possibility of final victory. The media often reinforced these alternative views rather than caused them.

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

- both refer to the fact that the media reported the fighting in detail. Source A refers to a specific battle while Source B suggests the war was reported 'battle by battle'
- both sources suggest that the media coverage was continuous and on-going. Source A's references to enthusiastic support implies a committed degree of coverage while Source B is more explicit when it refers to 'each morning's' papers covering the war.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that there are significant differences in terms of the impact of the media coverage on the attitudes of the American people. They may conclude that the nature of the coverage changed as the war became more aggressive and this led to a more explicit media view being taken which did begin to influence opinion.

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

How important was public opinion in the years 1965 to 1968 in encouraging President Johnson to withdraw US forces from Vietnam? (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 candidates 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.

Candidates 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.

Candidates should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** The media presented a positive and patriotic view of the war. As such public opinion would be sustained, at least for part of the Johnson administration, on a positive level. This source also suggests that the media had relatively little direct influence on opinion. This implies that the media was not used to undermine Johnson's Vietnam strategy. Since the media is generally regarded as a primary influence on public opinion, if it is positively determined to have such an influence, then opinion would not have figured significantly in influencing Johnson's thinking.
- **Source B:** This source clearly suggests that the media had a profoundly influential role in shaping opinion. It goes on to suggest that the reporting had a demoralising impact on the US general public. The media did not report significant US military victories nor did it report any lessening in the determination of North Vietnam or the VC to pursue the war. The real issue is highlighted in the final sentence.
- **Source C:** This source offers some clear factual detail on the rising tide of anti-war public opinion. Despite Johnson's claims that public opinion had only limited impact on his thinking, it is clear from the source that this was not the case. The final sentence clearly illustrates not only Johnson's awareness of public opinion but also the realisation that he could not resist it indefinitely unless a major US victory came along.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that public opinion was important in encouraging President Johnson to withdraw from Vietnam might include:

- he refused to stand for re-election in 1968. By this time the anti-war movement had escalated in numbers and it was politically impossible for Johnson to continue. Candidates may suggest that he wanted a way out of Vietnam but all his options based on a military solution had failed. He recognised that another leader would have to get the USA out. This was very much driven by his awareness of US popular opinion
- anti-war demonstrations had grown in size and frequency since 1965. Johnson knew that this vocal expression of opposition would only continue to rise as the US casualty rate rose. It was a further pressure forcing Johnson to acknowledge the reality of the USA's military limitations
- Johnson was aware of the fact that his policies based on military escalation had failed. Public opinion was not only expressed through demonstrations but also through the views of other US political leaders in Congress. The growing tide of public opinion against the war was echoed in Congress and this made it all the more difficult for Johnson to maintain a militaristic policy in Vietnam.

Factors suggesting an alternative view might include:

- the anti-war movement reflected only a part of US opinion, and by no means the majority of it. Although anti-war opinion increased it never came to threaten an overthrow of the US government

- what was important to Johnson was the realisation his policies had failed, particularly in view of a growing determination to continue by the enemy. This was more significant than US public opinion in moving Johnson to a withdrawal position
- the anti-war movement was not united or homogeneous. People had different reasons for being involved and different groups had different objectives. This inevitably weakened its effectiveness as a national pressure group.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Johnson could not ignore public opinion but it was only one among a number of factors. Perhaps the most significant was the realisation that US military power was not working.

Question 2

03 Explain why the Strategic Hamlets programme was implemented. (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 candidates 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 Kennedy supported the introduction and development of the Strategic Hamlets programme in South Vietnam.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- Kennedy was not yet committed to relying on US ground troops as the first choice route to dealing with the growth in the support for the VC. The Strategic Hamlets programme offered a less directly interventionist route for US support, which Kennedy favoured at this stage. It was a way of offering low level US support and thereby avoid military escalation by the US
- the US wanted Diem to develop social and economic reforms. This had happened in a very limited form up to this point. Built into the Strategic Hamlets programme were opportunities for social and economic improvements for the South Vietnamese rural population. The programme appeared to be the means through which the USA's desire for internal reforms that would strengthen Diem's regime would be achieved

- the immediate threat to South Vietnam came through the VC rather than the North Vietnamese Army. The Strategic Hamlets programme would deprive the VC of its means of support, in terms of food, for example. The hope was that it would cause the VC to 'wither on the vine'.
- the programme was an extension of an earlier and similar programme known as the agroville project. This had had some limited success.

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

- Diem's government was under increasing pressure to maintain political stability through some form of victory or success over the communist threat. This pressure had been building for some time. The Strategic Hamlets programme appeared to be a way of neutralising this long term decline
- Diem's unpopularity had been increasing since 1956. The USA was reluctant to remove Diem but they needed some effective alternative that would neutralise Diem's unpopularity and the consequent threat to US interests that it created. The Strategic Hamlets programme appeared to offer that solution.

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

- since 1960 the threat from the North and the VC had increased. This programme was a way to bring the expansion of support for the VC to an end by isolating the South Vietnamese rural population from exposure to VC propaganda
- the programme was introduced in the context of the Cuban Missile Crisis, which erupted in October 1962. The USA was increasingly sensitive to what it saw as the growing threat from international communism. A solution to the threat in South Vietnam had to be found.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link Kennedy's desire to remain committed to Vietnam with his equal concern about not escalating the USA's military role and strengthening the ability of the south to defend itself against the communist threat. The Strategic Hamlets programme was fundamental to the USA strategy by late 1962.

Question 2

- 04** 'Kennedy decided to increase US involvement in Vietnam because the south was unable to protect itself.'
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 candidates 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.

Candidates 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:

- Kennedy was well aware of the shortcomings of Diem's regime and particularly the weaknesses and limitations of the South Vietnamese Army. South Vietnam faced political instability and relied on a demoralised army to defend itself.
- since 1960 the VC and North Vietnam had intensified their efforts to establish an independent and united Vietnam. This was something that had not existed so prominently prior to Kennedy's election as President. There was a clear need for increased US support in view of the increased threat. This assumed an even greater significance as the USA was certain that North Vietnam was receiving aid from other communist states, particularly China
- the USA was committed to containment. This foundation of US foreign policy was predicated by the commitment to protect freedom wherever it was under threat. Kennedy was committed to continue this approach, therefore the USA was almost obliged to support South Vietnam. This commitment had become particularly important in view of the USA's need to preserve its credibility as a protector especially of Third World and newly independent states such as South Vietnam
- the need for protection had been recognised by Eisenhower and Kennedy was simply continuing a US policy that had already been firmly established.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- the USA needed to protect its own vital national interests. The spread of communism was always a threat to the USA. Therefore the primary reason to be involved was to protect the USA rather than the people of South Vietnam. Containment was first and foremost about protecting the USA
- Kennedy needed to take a stand against communism in order to promote his own political image as a Cold War warrior. This was more important than simply protecting South Vietnam *per se*
- Kennedy regarded South Vietnam as the cornerstone of USA interests in south east Asia. This was too important to place in the hands of the South Vietnamese Army alone.
- involvement in South Vietnam was consistent with the USA's long term policy of establishing a form of economic imperialism in order to strengthen its position as a global power. Candidates may suggest that even if South Vietnam had been able to protect itself the USA would still have intervened.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Kennedy did have a genuine concern for the people of South Vietnam and the preservation of their freedom against an increasingly more powerful enemy. However his primary concern was the USA and its national interests, and this is the reason why the USA became increasingly involved. The USA had assumed the role of a global superpower and simply could not avoid involvement irrespective of the strength of South Vietnam.

Question 3

05 Explain why President Nixon extended the war into Cambodia in 1970. (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 candidates 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 Nixon decided to extend the war into Cambodia, whilst at the same time carrying out his Vietnamisation programme.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- militarism, at least until 1971, was an integral element of Nixon's strategy of forcing North Vietnam into peace negotiations with a weakened negotiating position
- the invasion involved large numbers of South Vietnamese troops rather than US ground forces, therefore it was relatively low risk in terms of US casualties
- the attack was part of Nixon's strategy to buy time in order to make his policy of Vietnamisation work. He needed to strengthen the South Vietnamese army, partly by keeping the military pressure on the North Vietnamese so they could not further undermine the South Vietnamese Army
- there were real enemy targets in Cambodia that did represent a continued threat to the south and therefore to US interests.

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

- there had been a long term decline in US public support for the war. The nature of the invasion of Cambodia enabled Nixon to present it as a necessary, and effective, action and one that he hoped would restore a degree of support for this approach
- Vietnamisation had begun and was well underway. Nixon had to replace the removal of ground forces with air assaults if his long term strategy was to succeed. Cambodia offered a sound contribution to the de-escalation of the USA's role.

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

- Nixon wanted to maintain some level of military pressure on North Vietnam. His bombing campaigns against the north in 1969 had proved to be very unpopular both among his own advisers and many in the US general public. The invasion of Cambodia was a viable alternative to this approach
- Nixon wanted to support the pro-US government of Cambodia against a threat from the communist Khmer Rouge. The pro-US leader, General Lon Nol had taken power in March 1970.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might develop a linkage between Nixon's policy of Vietnamisation and what appeared to be a completely contradictory policy of extending the war into Cambodia. They may explain the link between militarism and diplomacy and show how Cambodia fitted into this approach adopted by Nixon.

Question 3

06 'Although the peace negotiations began in 1971, it was the USA that prevented a final end to the conflict being reached until 1975.'

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 candidates 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.

Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that the USA delayed the final conclusion of the war against those that suggest other factors contributed more significantly to the slow conclusion of the war.

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

- the USA continued military action against the North. References may be made to the Linebacker bombing campaigns for example. This approach, although it was designed to strengthen the USA negotiating position only served to strengthen the North Vietnamese's determination not to submit to such US pressure. The action reinforced a stalemate and thereby delayed a resolution
- Nixon promised to provide economic aid to South Vietnam and, more significantly, provide huge quantities of military hardware to the South Vietnamese Army
- the USA continued to attack communist insurgents.

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

- the USA was proactive in initiating the negotiations as early as 1971. These early negotiations collapsed in November 1971 because neither side could reach a final agreement a number of issues, e.g. the removal of President Thieu from South Vietnam.
- Nixon attempted to extend diplomacy beyond Vietnam in order to end the war. In 1972 he visited China in order to get the Chinese to put pressure on North Vietnam to end the war.
- by 1972 the USA had agreed to accept new conditions for peace. This spirit of compromise taken by the USA in October 1972 was a clear indication of a willingness to bring the war to an end. Candidates could illustrate the nature and extent of this US compromise through a detailed review of the agreement
- after the Paris Peace Agreement the NLF, backed by North Vietnam, continued to use military action in South Vietnam
- Congress approved an amendment in June 1973 requiring an immediate end to military operations in Indo-China

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that the USA was determined to get out of Vietnam. The real obstacles to peace that the USA imposed had been removed by 1973. Despite this the USA continued to provide military aid to the South and it was this that delayed a final resolution because it enabled the South to pose a source of resistance to unification.