



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2Q

The USA and Vietnam, 1961–1975

Mark Scheme

2009 examination – January series

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 © 2009 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 2009

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

HIS2Q: The USA and Vietnam, 1961–1975

Question 1

- (a) 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 President Johnson's willingness to commit the USA to the use of military force in Vietnam. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

Differences

- While **Source B** links US vital....national interests to involvement in Vietnam, **Source A** asks what is this worth to this country?
- **Source B** adopts a positive stance towards the 'use of armed force' while **Source A** is much more wary about this, as indicated in the first line.
- **Source B** is giving Johnson Congressional support while **Source A** has Johnson pessimistic about the political impact of the military escalation in Vietnam on him. He asks what...is Vietnam worth to me?
- **Source B** exudes determination and confidence and a certainty in the democratic correctness of the US intentions. It is implicit that as President, Johnson shares these views. The final line of **Source A** underlines the pessimism and apparent uncertainty felt by Johnson.

Similarities

- Both sources display a commitment to greater involvement. This is more apparent in the final sentence of each source. However reluctant Johnson is he is still willing to go through with it. In **Source B** there is an unequivocal commitment.
- This commitment, evident in both sources is further reinforced by the mutual certainty that US interests are at stake. **Source A** has Johnson arguing that the US has no choice other than to take a stand or face communists chasing 'you into your own kitchen', while **Source B** states that protecting US national interests is a key motive and one which the President clearly acknowledges.

Candidates may refer to Johnson's commitment to continuity of US policy in Vietnam. Kennedy had established a military role in Vietnam, albeit of a limited scale. He had also referred to Vietnam as the cornerstone of democracy in the Far East. The views defined in the Gulf of Tonkin resolution are consistent with this position. Candidates may develop some knowledge around the events of August 1964 and suggest Johnson's complicity in these. Equally candidates may explore Johnson's pre-Tonkin thinking and suggest that there was reluctance. Johnson was a realist and he was aware of the imperialistic role America might be faced with in Vietnam through armed intervention.

- (b) Use **Source A, B and C** and your own knowledge.

How important was President Johnson in bringing about an escalation of the war in Vietnam in the years 1964 to 1968?

(24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

- **Source A** may suggest that Johnson had the potential to act as a restraining force on the escalation process.
- **Source B** presents Johnson as the leader and prime mover in policy making on Vietnam
- **Source C** refers to the importance of Johnson's political and military advisers. It also addresses the weaknesses in South Vietnam.
- They may consider the military influences applied to Johnson's thinking. The military argued that the war was winnable.
- Johnson undoubtedly underestimated the determination of the opposition and its capacity to resist US military power. There was a degree of national arrogance in Johnson which made him susceptible to domestic political and military pressure.
- Johnson wanted to be seen in the mould of Kennedy and as a president who would adopt a hard line against communism, particularly so soon after the clear evidence of communist expansionism in Cuba. He was still committed to the idea of containment in all its forms, including the military interventionist form.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why President Kennedy believed that keeping South Vietnam free from Communism was essential for the protection of the USA's national interests. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

- Kennedy was committed to containment. This commitment led to two very clear perceptions. One was that containment would protect US economic and business interests on a global scale, and secondly that the US had a moral responsibility to use its economic power to protect democracy in the face of communist expansionism. Containment was central to US interests.
- Vietnam was a key state in SE Asia and the Far East as a whole. Kennedy was committed to the domino theory and he was certain that it was a reality in Asia. Any expansion of communist influence in this region would challenge US interests.
- Kennedy was aware of the spread of communism into China in 1949 and North Korea. He saw these as further examples of the validity of containment.
- By showing the US could deliver on containment this reinforced the US's status as a credible cold war power and an international power. This in turn helped to protect the USA's national interest.

- (b) President Kennedy was not a supporter of US involvement in the war in Vietnam.
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

Supporter of US involvement

Candidates may suggest that because of his commitment to containment and his view that a gain for North Vietnam was a gain for the USSR and China, Kennedy was willing to use military force to enforce containment. Kennedy was the first president to put US troops into Vietnam. Once this decision had been taken then there was an inevitability about escalation. Others may explore the links with Diem and suggest that the strategy of using local political leaders to protect the south had failed and the US had to adopt a more proactive stance.

Not a supporter of US involvement

Candidates may comment on Kennedy's flexible response approach may be seen as diplomacy. Kennedy may be seen as a leader who was under the control of his advisors. He did not want military escalation but some of them did. The Taylor–Rostow report, 1961 might be used to illustrate this process. A key policy under Kennedy was the Strategic Hamlets Programme. Candidates may see this as clear evidence that military escalation was not Kennedy's main strategy.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why President Nixon introduced the policy of 'Vietnamisation' in 1969. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

- 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. **0-2**
- 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

- Nixon accepted that the US could not be guaranteed a military victory in Vietnam. He needed a way out of Vietnam and this policy at least provided a means by which US troops could be gradually withdrawn.
- Nixon was sensitive to the political implications of the war in Vietnam. He did not want to face the growing internal opposition from anti-war campaigners nor the hostility of Republican voters who could not accept defeat managed by Nixon. He wanted to be re-elected.
- Vietnamisation was one part of the package of strategies designed to enable the USA to leave Vietnam with some degree of honour.
- Candidates may refer to the wider context of the Cold War and the development of détente. It was becoming increasingly clear by 1969 that containment as the foundation of US foreign policy was no longer achieving its objective of guaranteeing US vital national interests.
- The policy would open up a clearer diplomatic route for a solution and thereby lessen the military approach. US diplomacy may be taken more seriously in the context of troop reductions.

- (b) 'It was military defeat that forced the Americans to withdraw from Vietnam.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

- 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. **0-6**
- 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

Candidates may argue that the USA did not experience military defeat. There is scope to examine the USA's military record from 1965 and suggest that under Johnson there were no decisive military victories but nor were there significant defeats. A key event might be the Tet Offensive, 1968. Candidates may argue that although this was a crushing humiliation for the US military machine it was a real military setback for the Vietcong.

Similarly, during the Nixon administration, the US military machine continued despite Vietnamisation. The war was extended to Laos and Cambodia. US militarisation under Nixon may be seen as a device to strengthen the US negotiating position rather than as part of a continuing military failure of the Johnson kind.

Some candidates may suggest that between 1965 and 1975 US militarism did fail. Johnson's refusal to be re-elected, Vietnamisation and the focus on bombing campaigns all underline the failure.

Other factors

Candidates may place the post-1969 period in the era of détente and suggest that given the shifting intensity of the Cold War context and it would not significantly reinforce US power. Reference may also be made to the opportunities Nixon saw for exploiting the divisions amongst the communist states. Nixon visited China as part of the USA's strategy to cultivate its support in the USA withdrawal. This move was also a clear way of reinforcing the USA's Cold War status.