



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2Q

The USA and Vietnam, 1961–1975

Mark Scheme

2010 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 © 2010 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 2010

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 Kennedy's concern for South Vietnam's independence. (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 generic levels scheme.

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

- Source B concludes that Kennedy would have withdrawn from Vietnam because he came to regard communism as a successful and pervasive force there. Source A presents Kennedy as determined to help and protect South Vietnam from the spread of communism and the threat that it posed to South Vietnam's independence
- Source B suggests that Kennedy was prepared to abandon the Domino Theory, and by implication, containment in Vietnam. Implied in Source A is the view that Kennedy was

upholding the USA's commitment to containment and therefore its commitment to the Domino Theory

- whilst Source B suggests that US aid to South Vietnam would be military, Kennedy rejects this as an unacceptable cost in young American lives. Source A suggests that Kennedy is willing to use 'measures' to 'assist' South Vietnam to protect its independence. This vagueness may imply that anything up to and including military force is possible.

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

- there was a growing degree of popular support amongst the South Vietnamese peasants for communism because it was closely linked to the wider aim of Vietnamese nationalism present in the Vietcong
- the Domino Theory was basic to US foreign policy during the Cold War years. It was a further re-statement of containment and together these concepts formed the foundations of US relations with the communist world
- up to this point the US had offered economic and political aid to South Vietnam. Only with the arrival of Kennedy did the possibility of military aid, and its expansion, emerge. Reference may be made to the nature of Kennedy's military aid and its gradual development through 'advisors'.

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

- both sources suggest US involvement. Source A refers to the USA's willingness to 'help'. The fact that Source B suggests Kennedy may have 'pulled us out' clearly implies that the US must have been 'in' Vietnam. Both sources suggest a degree of commitment on the part of the USA towards South Vietnam
- both sources suggest that the USA's commitment to responding proactively to the Domino Theory is less than developed. Source A emphasises the USA's lack of interest in anything beyond preserving peace and the independence of South Vietnam. There is no suggestion of a wider geo-strategic interest in Southeast Asia. Similarly, Source B suggests that the US will accept the need to abandon any US interest in Southeast Asia. There is a geo-political interest, but it will not be pursued.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that there are a number of significant differences. Despite this there are, equally, a number of important similarities.

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

How far was president Kennedy determined to use military force in South Vietnam in order to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia? (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: presents the communist regime as aggressive and expansionist. Reference to Kennedy's focus on the protection of South Vietnam from communist control is clear. This source also refers to the increasing ability of South Vietnam to defend itself and preserve its independence. This suggests that the USA's primary purpose was to use whatever methods were necessary, including the use of military force
- Source B: this implies that South Vietnam was a crucial part of communist ambitions in Southeast Asia. The key sentence in this source is the final one. Withdrawal from South Vietnam would have led to the realisation of the Domino Theory. The source implicitly challenges the notion that Kennedy was willing to use military force to protect South Vietnam
- Source C: clearly places the conflict within the context of the Cold War. Implicit in this is containment. The source illustrates the growing military commitment that the USA made during the Kennedy Presidency and the determination of the 'enemy' to overcome this. The source also suggests alternatives to the use of military force, e.g. the Strategic Hamlets Programme.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting Kennedy was determined to use military force to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia might include:

- he was a well known anti-communist and often criticised the Eisenhower administration for its apparent soft liner against communism
- he first introduced a US military presence of any size into Vietnam
- he was committed to the idea of containment and the Domino Theory. Containment certainly allowed for the use of military force by the USA
- he saw Southeast Asia as particularly exposed to the threat of communism.

Factors suggesting that Kennedy was not/less determined to use military force might include:

- Kennedy was reluctant to commit conventional US military forces. He sent 'advisers'
- he wanted a diplomatic solution to the crisis
- the issue of the USA vested interests is crucial. Kennedy did not see these being fulfilled by the loss of US lives in Vietnam. Memories of the Second World War and Korea were still raw in the US mentality
- the Cuban Missile Crisis had moved Kennedy away from militarism.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that on balance Kennedy was loath to use military force but he was not closed to the option.

Question 2

- (a) Explain why President Johnson began the mass bombing of Vietnam. (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 Johnson began the mass bombing of Vietnam.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the USA had the military capacity and economic strength to embark on a prolonged bombing campaign in the North
- the North was not in a strong position to resist large-scale mass bombing. North Vietnam was a relatively easy target
- bombing was a low-cost strategy. It needed relatively few military personnel and certainly risked fewer casualties than ground troops faced. In this sense it was a positive political step for the Johnson administration
- Johnson wanted to bring the conflict in Vietnam to a rapid conclusion and flexing the USA's military and economic might was seen as a sound route to achieve this.

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

- previous US strategies had not reaped rewards. Limited military action during the Kennedy administration had expanded but this was not delivering a stronger negotiating position for the USA, nor was it seriously weakening the military strength of the North
- Saigon was politically unstable and military limited. This problem dated back to Diem and his assassination in November 1963 added to the political crisis facing South Vietnam's leadership, and the consequent reinforcement of the North's determination. The bombing was a planned strategy to address this ongoing problem. The bombing was designed to reinforce the South's morale and show that the North could be defeated or made weak enough that a victory for the South was possible.

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

- on 6 February 1965 NLF units attacked the US military base in Pleiku. This immediately resulted in a retaliatory US bombing campaign. This attack justified what many regarded as Johnson's plan to embarking on a bombing campaign against North Vietnam
- on 13 February Johnson authorised Operation Rolling Thunder. This formed the basis of Johnson's strategy to weaken North Vietnam's military strength. In addition to the aim of weakening North Vietnam's military capability, Johnson's bombing campaign was also designed to force the North to accept a negotiated settlement which the USA would enter into from a position of strength.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link the determination of Johnson to end the conflict with the USA's economic and military power. They may also consider the period 1965 to 1968 and the various bombing campaigns that were undertaken and assess their effectiveness in terms of achieving US goals.

- (b) 'In the years 1965 to 1970 the greatest influence on American public opinion towards Vietnam was the My Lai massacre.'

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 that view given against that which does not.

Evidence which agrees might include:

- the massacre triggered further anti-war protests in the USA

- there was extensive media coverage about the massacre which also stimulated a public response. This was linked to the wider war and brought into question its validity
- the massacre sharpened American public opinion. The victims were largely innocent women, children and old people
- it linked with the growing view that the war was invalid in every sense. In many ways it legitimised to the American public that the anti-war campaign which had been going on for so long was correct.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- many Americans were untouched by the massacre. They chose to continue their faith in the patriotism, and therefore the rightness of the actions, of US troops in Vietnam
- other factors influenced US opinion both for and against the war. The Tet Offensive was perceived as a positive outcome by some Americans and as a negative by others
- the movement for ending the war was already well established and all the massacre did was add to this already well established attitude
- there was plenty of other evidence to influence US public opinion, not least the extensive bombing campaigns instituted by the Johnson administration.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that the massacre was simply a further factor that reinforced already well-established opposition to the war. Equally, candidates may suggest that the massacre was such a shock and such a piece of blatant un-Americanism that it revealed the war for what it was.

Question 3

- (a) Explain why the Tet Offensive was launched in 1968. (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 the North Vietnamese launched a widespread attack against South Vietnam during the generally agreed non-conflict period of the Tet religious holiday.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the North wanted to use the offensive to undermine and further destabilise the South Vietnamese government
- the offensive was aimed at deepening the demoralisation of US troops
- it would fuel the growing anti-war movement in the USA and thereby place increased pressure on the US government
- it would convince the US government that the people of South Vietnam were united in their resistance to American imperialism in South Vietnam.

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

- US policy had become inflexible. Johnson had merely escalated the number of US troops in Vietnam. This offensive would create a shock wave that might force a shift in this long term US approach
- the North needed to do something to reinforce the support it depended upon from southern nationalists and communists. The offensive was a gesture of commitment to the South and it was thereby designed to reinforce the long-term support many southern peasants had given to the North's efforts.

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

- 1968 was a Presidential election year. An offensive of the kind that emerged would undermine Johnson and therefore undermine the political strength of the USA to continue the conflict
- it was a religious holiday that made it the perfect time to act.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the interrelationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link the importance of the need to undermine the confidence of the USA with the idea that the North could carry out such an effective and audacious attack. Essentially the issue is one of explanation and showing how the various causal factors are linked and then reaching a decision as to their relative importance.

- (b) 'In the years 1969 to 1973, President Nixon's policies towards Southeast Asia showed that he was only interested in a military solution.'

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.

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

- Nixon began a war against Cambodia and Laos
- the bombing war against North Vietnam was increased
- Vietnamisation was imply a political device to placate the American public for Nixon's own political agenda

- under Nixon the USA continued to supply and finance the expansion of the South Vietnamese army.

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

- Vietnamisation may be viewed as a genuine attempt by Nixon to reduce the USA's military commitment to Vietnam
- Nixon wanted to sign up to détente and this illustrated his rejection of militarism as a first choice tool for US foreign policy
- for Nixon, militarism was a means rather than an end. He wanted to establish a stronger negotiating position for the USA. Essentially Nixon was a diplomat rather than a militarist
- there is plenty of evidence to illustrate the USA's commitment to a diplomatic solution.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Nixon was a complex individual but his primary approach to Vietnam was to do something fundamentally different from Johnson. Equally, candidates may argue that Nixon was a ruthless and self-interested politician who would do anything he needed to survive. In this case a militaristic approach was relevant and essential for this kind of political leader.