



**General Certificate of Education
June 2010**

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 © 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

June 2010

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 United States' attack on Cambodia in 1970. (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 A suggests that the attack on Cambodia was controlled by Nixon. He was responsible for escalating the war and he was able to act independently of any other authority. Source B suggests that Nixon was subordinate to others. It refers to 'Nixon's opponents' imposing restrictions on him
- Source A suggests that the attack on Cambodia had a positive outcome. Large amounts of enemy resources were destroyed. Source B sees the attack in terms of a disaster. It was too limited and therefore ineffective

- Source A refers to the possibility that the attack had ‘won time for America’. Source B is focused on the view that North Vietnam’s diplomatic position had been strengthened and so challenges the idea that America had gained a stronger diplomatic position and further time to consolidate this position.

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

- the detail in Source A can be developed by reference to the nature of the anti-war movement in the USA following the invasion e.g. the Kent State University massacre. North Vietnam was not weakened by the invasion and was still able to maintain a strong position on diplomacy
- Cambodia became a communist state, as did South Vietnam. Candidates may explore the aims and nature of the domino theory and suggest that it was a failure in southeast Asia
- candidates may explore the actions of Nixon’s political opponents and the increasing view that Nixon was misleading the US people. He had entered this conflict secretly and became focused on presenting a positive spin to something that was clearly a military and political failure.

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

- both sources accept that Cambodia suffered and experienced negative outcomes as a result of the invasion
- both sources acknowledge that the attack resulted in political opposition in the USA. Source B refers to the political successes of Nixon’s anti-war opponents. Source A also refers to ‘Nixon’s critics’.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, candidates may conclude that there is a degree of difference in the range of conclusions drawn from the US invasion of Cambodia. Kissinger is far more cautious and defensive in his analysis than is Ambrose.

Question 1**02** Use **Sources A, B and C** and your own knowledge.How far was America's final withdrawal from Vietnam in 1975 the result of its military mistakes? (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:** refers to the military success of the attack. It was two years before the North Vietnamese were able to launch another effective assault on South Vietnam
- **Source B:** this source presents a more positive view of the military action and its impact. Kissinger suggests that the USA had the military strength to do more in Cambodia and beyond, but this was frustrated by Nixon's opponents. This indicates that the invasion of Cambodia was not a military mistake and ultimately it was not military mistakes that resulted in America's final withdrawal from Vietnam
- **Source C:** this emphasises the military limitations of the USA in Vietnam by 1975 and the military strength of the North Vietnamese army. It does not directly suggest any specific military mistakes by the USA. The focus is more on the strength of the North Vietnamese rather than the military errors of the Americans.

From candidates' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the links between withdrawal and military mistakes might include:

- the policy of Vietnamisation was a failure. The USA attempted to hand over the war and the defence of South Vietnam to the South Vietnamese army. Despite massive aid and support that army remained demoralised and militarily ineffective
- Vietnamisation also brought the systematic withdrawal of US ground forces. They were the elite of the military forces and their withdrawal undoubtedly strengthened the North Vietnamese both in terms of their relative fighting power and their overall morale
- the invasion of Cambodia and Laos generated huge opposition in America. These military actions served to increase the pressure on the US government to find a solution
- the strategy of increased bombing campaigns against the North in order to strengthen the USA's negotiating position failed. The North showed no signs of bowing to this strategy and ultimately it failed and that pushed the USA closed to withdrawal via a non-military route.

Factors suggesting it was not military mistakes that led to withdrawal might include:

- Nixon began his administration with a commitment to withdraw. The decision to leave with some element of 'peace with honour' had already been taken before any military mistakes became relevant
- candidates may explore the attempts to broker diplomatic solutions and suggest that it was a failure to establish a degree of compromise that stopped an earlier withdrawal but once that compromise was reached then withdrawal became a reality. The USA's military performance may be seen as largely irrelevant to this
- the military power of the North Vietnamese was irresistible by 1974. It was not the military failures of the USA but rather the military strengths of the North Vietnamese that led to the final withdrawal.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that although there were military mistakes the withdrawal was inevitable from 1969. It was not a matter of military failure by the USA but

rather a question of the timing of the point when the USA could argue that it had achieved 'peace with honour'.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why there was a leadership crisis in South Vietnam in the years 1963 to 1964.
(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and 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 there was a leadership crisis in South Vietnam in the years 1963 to 1964.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- although Diem created numerous problems that led to instability he also held South Vietnam together. His assassination created a huge political vacuum
- the USA would not back the regime of General Minh because of his neutralist stance. Consequently his regime toppled quickly. This gave greater confidence to the Vietcong and further alienated the South Vietnamese rural population.
- Diem had been overthrown by a generals' coup. There was no obvious single leader in place from amongst this group.

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

- Diem's failure to establish any real political stability in South Vietnam from 1954. There was no consensus and he failed to create political unity which ultimately led to the exposure of the extent of the political disunity and instability when he was assassinated in November 1963
- the social and economic problems of South Vietnam had been escalating since 1954. The population was largely disillusioned with the war and was unwilling to offer support to any regime that still backed the USA. Diem had failed to put in place the economic and social reforms necessary to encourage the population to want to fight for what they had through a non-communist system. This was a major causal factor in the failure of the political system and the leadership crisis that reflected it.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors

- there was no obvious successor to Diem.
- Diem's successors were largely ineffective as leaders. Neither General Minh nor Nguyen Khanh showed any real leadership qualities in the face of mounting problems from the growth in popularity of the Vietcong.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might argue that it was the influence of the USA that was a major factor. It had supported a regime that was failing and it undermined Minh and continued to back a weak regime. The impact of this weakness led to the growth in popularity of the Vietcong and this became a critical factor in perpetuating political instability and leadership weakness in South Vietnam. Essentially it was a combination of Diem's legacy, the rise of the Vietcong and American interference that led to the political crisis of 1963-64.

Question 2

- 04** 'The successes of the Vietcong in the years 1965 to 1968 were due to the effectiveness of its military tactics.'
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:

- Tet was a defeat but it was also a propaganda success for the VC. The military tactic employed during Tet enabled the VC to show that the US military was not invulnerable and this ultimately added to the communist/nationalist victory over the USA
- the guerrilla tactics used by the VC were almost impossible to combat effectively. They led to the systematic erosion of US forces through increasing casualties. This increased the anti-war response in the USA
- the tactics succeeded in forcing the USA to adopt a policy of escalation during the period 1965 to 1968. This meant more casualties and more opposition and therefore more pressure
- the VC succeeded in winning more support amongst the peasants. The US response to VC action was one of organised terror directed against the civilian population. This served to strengthen VC support.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- the Tet Offensive was a massive failure for the Vietcong. They ceased to function as a fighting force as a result of their losses during Tet
- the VC was never strong enough to engage in significant military confrontations with the US army or the South Vietnamese army. It was never able to deliver a final blow of the kind the French had experienced at Dien Bien Phu
- the VC had a political message which was increasingly popular with the people. It was not merely communist it was also a nationalist movement. Its success lay in its ability to propagandise and not merely through its military tactics.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that military tactics were merely a contributory factor rather than the entire explanation for VC success. A balanced response would be one that was able to integrate and evaluate the relative importance of the military tactics and the other factors which contributed to the VC's success.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was adopted by the USA in August 1964. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and 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 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was adopted in August 1964.

Candidates might include some of the following factors:

- the policy of North Vietnam towards the South had become increasingly aggressive. At the Ninth Plenum in November 1963 the North Vietnamese Communist Party announced an intensification of the struggle on the South. Johnson needed more control over US policy in Vietnam in order to respond to this intensification
- the Vietcong's control over the South Vietnamese peasantry was steadily growing. The Strategic Hamlets programme appeared not to be working. Johnson needed an effective alternative to this approach
- the leadership on the South was no more popular that it had been under Diem. President Khanh's association with the USA was unpopular and therefore there was an increasing urgency for the USA to bring the pressure from the North to an effective conclusion

- there was a conviction amongst US political leaders that Johnson was reliable and could be trusted to deploy the USA's military superiority effectively against the North. Such pressure would lead to a stronger diplomatic position for the USA when that point was reached

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

- nothing the USA had done so far since 1961 in South Vietnam appeared to be working. Candidates may give examples of Kennedy's policies and the use of military advisers rather than the expansion of US air and ground forces
- since 1961 there had been political instability in South Vietnam. Candidates may explore the impact of Diem's regime and the need to consolidate support for a non-communist regime in South Vietnam before it was too late.

And some of the following short-term/immediate factors

- US naval vessels had been attacked in the Gulf of Tonkin by North Vietnamese forces in August 1964. This enabled the USA to present North Vietnam as a regional aggressor. It was, therefore, the role of the USA to come to the aid of vulnerable states in South East Asia
- it was politically useful for Johnson's electoral campaign in 1964. He needed to show the US public that he could be firm against communism. This was something his political opponent, Barry Goldwater, told the US was not happening.

To reach higher levels, candidates will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might consider the links between the USA's military strength and the certainty held by US politicians that the US could use a military approach to achieve success. This was particularly important in terms of the weak and unpopular leadership that existed in South Vietnam.

Question 6

- 06** 'The Tet Offensive of 1968 was an overwhelming success for the North Vietnamese.'
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 or disagree with the view that the Tet Offensive was an overwhelming success for the North Vietnamese.

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

- Tet represented a turning point in US strategy in Vietnam. Nixon, prior to his Presidential election campaign realised that a military victory in South Vietnam was not possible. Military withdrawal was the only option and this would ultimately lead to a massive reduction of the USA's ability to achieve its stated objective of ensuring that South Vietnam remained a non-communist state
- the Offensive had a direct impact on US domestic politics. Most significantly it led to Johnson refusing to stand for a further term as President
- the rapidly declining morale of the US military in Vietnam was further escalated by the scale of the Tet Offensive. The USA's military effectiveness was profoundly compromised by Tet
- the North became even more determined that a victory over the USA was possible. It strengthened their resolve and had a major impact on enabling them to resist the subsequent new strategies that Nixon went on to introduce and which were designed to undermine Northern resolve prior to diplomatic negotiations.

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

- the military effectiveness of the VC was significantly damaged. The military capability of the anti-US forces in Vietnam was profoundly damaged and only the North Vietnamese army was in any kind of position to continue the military struggle
- although the Offensive convinced the USA that a purely military solution was no longer possible it did not lead to an immediate withdrawal of US forces. There was no fundamental change in the ultimate US objectives as far as South Vietnam was concerned
- in the medium to long term the USA military strategy towards the conflict shifted to bombing North Vietnam. A number of major bombing campaigns were instituted e.g. the Linebacker assaults. These can be linked to the shift in the US administration and as a direct result of the Tet Offensive.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that the Tet Offensive was a victory for both sides. It finally placed the USA into a position where it could consider an alternative to military escalation and one that would enable it to find a way out of the quagmire of commitment to South Vietnam. Equally it was the first step along the route to unification for the North. In a sense this view could be presented as a long term outcome. The short term may argue that the Offensive was a defeat for both sides. This is particularly true in terms of the military outcomes, especially for the North. Overall candidates may offer a range of combinations in their analysis, centred on victory and defeat for each side.