



**General Certificate of Education
January 2012**

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 students' 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 students' 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 students' reactions to a particular paper. Assumptions about future mark schemes on the basis of one year's document should be avoided; whilst the guiding principles of assessment remain constant, details will change, depending on the content of a particular examination paper.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

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

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered 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 students. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses students' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

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

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

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

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

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

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

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

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

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

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

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

January 2012

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 removal from power of President Diem. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the levels scheme.

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

- Source A suggests that the USA must be proactive in any attempt to overthrow Diem. The USA is fundamentally committed to the process. Source B favours a non-proactive approach. Essentially the sources differ in the extent of active involvement by the USA
- Source A seeks to rationalise US commitment by emphasising that Diem is unpopular in both the USA and South Vietnam, and the war is unwinnable while his administration is in place. Source B is much less clear about the reasons to overthrow Diem. This lack

of rationale underlines the relatively limited determination of the US to adopt a direct US driven overthrow plan

- the date of each source is important. In Source A Dean Rush emphasises that he is in full agreement with the policy he was instructed to implement. That was on 29 August. Bundy is suggesting the President only confirmed any US action on 5 October.

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

- Kennedy had spent much of his Presidency supporting Diem. That was the foundation of US strategy in Vietnam and Kennedy maintained the traditional US approach of believing the Diem was the only viable alternative
- Kennedy had no immediate plan to escalate US military involvement in Vietnam. Overthrowing Diem could have further destabilised an already unstable state and thereby strengthened the North Vietnamese.

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

- both sources accept that the USA should back the overthrow of Diem, albeit through differing degrees of involvement
- both sources suggest complicity with an alternative leadership once Diem has been removed. Source A refers explicitly to Vietnamese generals while Source B refers implicitly to 'alternative leadership'
- both sources suggest that there is US political support for the overthrow. This exists both in Washington, through the President and in Vietnam through the US Ambassador.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that the USA had come to the realisation that the Diem regime was failing. Other evidence to reinforce this could be the failed Strategic Hamlets program and the regimes response to Buddhism and the public outrage this produced in Vietnam. The degree of commitment may appear to vary but the ultimate willingness to support an overthrow had not diminished.

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

How far was President Kennedy committed to protecting South Vietnam? (24 marks)

*Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)***Levels Mark Scheme**

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

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

Students should use the sources as evidence in their answer.

Relevant material from the sources would include:

- **Source A:** This suggests that there was political will in Washington and that was driven by Kennedy. The source refers to 'We are launched on a course . . .' and 'I am in full agreement with the policy I was instructed to carry out.' This could only have come from Kennedy. Diem was in danger of preventing the USA fulfilling its aim of keeping South Vietnam non-communist
- **Source B:** This source specifically notes that Kennedy has agreed to US participation in the overthrow strategy. The emphasis is very much more on protecting the USA than protecting democracy in South Vietnam
- **Source C:** This is a very useful source in that it makes clear Kennedy's firm objective of protecting South Vietnam. However, this view is tempered by the reference to the importance of the USA being able to withdraw from Vietnam.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that Kennedy was committed to protecting democracy in South Vietnam might include:

- Kennedy's foreign policy was based on containment. An essential element of containment was the preservation of democracy in the face of expansionist communism. Vietnam was a classic example of this process in action
- Kennedy had already expanded the USA's military presence in South Vietnam through his use of US military advisers and the Green Berets
- Kennedy had endorsed the Strategic Hamlets program. This was seen as a fundamental tool in neutralising the influence of the VC in rural South Vietnam. This in turn was a way to prevent the spread of communism and thereby protect democracy.

Factors suggesting that Kennedy's priority was to get out of Vietnam even if that meant abandoning it to communism might include:

- the level of military expansion was very limited. Although Kennedy did increase the number it was always relative small overall. This suggests he did not intend to commit the USA at any price
- Kennedy was interested in moving towards some form of diplomacy which was focused on getting the US out of Vietnam rather than primarily being aimed at guaranteeing the integrity of Vietnamese democracy
- it was beginning to become apparent that containment was not an infallible approach for the US to adopt. The outcome of the Cuban missile crisis had made this self-evident to Kennedy.

Good answers may conclude that although Kennedy did not want a long term involvement for the USA militarily he had not merely abandoned South Vietnam to the onslaught of communism. There was still a strong degree of popular support for containment and Kennedy could not afford to disregard this.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why President Johnson escalated US involvement in Vietnam in 1965. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons explaining why President Johnson made the decision to reinforce the USA's commitment to South Vietnam through military escalation in 1965.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- in 1965 there was a groundswell of popular support for Johnson and this underpinned his confidence and this, in turn, drove his determination to end the conflict by using the superior technology and military power available to the USA
- the South Vietnamese government was unstable and there was absolutely no certainty that South Vietnamese forces could repel the increasing threat from the VC and the North Vietnamese
- an increased use of military power was seen as a way of forcing the North Vietnamese to the negotiating table. The aim of escalation was to put the USA in a stronger

negotiating position and in turn ensure that its objectives would be fulfilled, quickly and effectively.

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

- Johnson was determined to rise to the 'Kennedy legacy' and to the longstanding US commitment to containment. This was still the foundation of US Cold War foreign policy and Johnson was firmly committed to preserving it in 1965.

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

- The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution had been instituted in August 1964. This gave Johnson the power to make whatever policy and strategic decisions he wished. Johnson had the constitutional and political power to carry out an escalation
- US bases in South Vietnam were under attack from North Vietnamese forces. Reference may be made to the attack on Pleiku in February 1965 and to other attacks in early 1965.

To reach the higher levels students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. They may suggest that there was a clear element of arrogance in Johnson's thinking. He was convinced of the USA's military effectiveness and he was determined to use this to pressurise the North Vietnamese in order to fulfil the fundamentals of US policy, i.e. containment. There was, in Johnson's mind, no meaningful alternative, despite his attempts to establish one.

Question 2

- 04** 'In the years 1965 to 1968, it was the anti-war movement in the USA that convinced President Johnson that his policy of escalation had failed.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

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

Evidence which agree(s) might include:

- there was a diverse range of anti-war protest. Although this, to some extent, weakened its impact it also reflected a very wide cross-section of US society. Increasingly the anti-war protest movement was integrated into the very significant equal rights protest movement. Johnson simply could not allow Vietnam to have such a damaging impact on US domestic politics and developments
- mass protests were increasing and often supported by the US media. Throughout this period there was a growing realisation that order and stability in the USA was endangered every day the war continued in its present form
- the media played a key role in influencing public opinion, particularly through visual presentations on a daily basis of events in Vietnam. These often deepened opposition to the war amongst many who had originally backed it. Johnson could not ignore the rising tide of popular opposition.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- it was the Tet Offensive that convinced Johnson that escalation had failed
- the ever rising casualty rates spoke for themselves. The more troops that were sent into Vietnam the more casualties resulted
- there was growing political opposition within Congress.

Good answers may conclude that the anti-war movement undoubtedly played a part in Johnson's acceptance that escalation had failed but there were other, possibly more significant factors. Perhaps the most significant was the Tet Offensive.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Nixon Doctrine was announced in June 1969. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why President Nixon announced a new approach in the form of the so-called Nixon Doctrine.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the Tet Offensive had convinced Nixon that victory in Vietnam could not be achieved purely through military means. A policy of simply continuing to escalate the number of US troops in Vietnam would not prove successful
- Nixon did not want to be seen as the President who lost Vietnam. Therefore he had to devise a new strategy in order to avoid the domestic political consequences of an increasingly unpopular war amongst the US public
- the Doctrine offered a legitimate way out of Vietnam without appearing to suggest a US defeat
- it was part of a more complex strategy designed to reinforce the USA's diplomatic strength in future negotiations with the North Vietnamese.

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

- military escalation and bombing campaigns adopted since 1965 had failed to achieve any meaningful progress in terms of resolving the USA's role in Vietnam. The number of US casualties had progressively risen and this had had a political consequence in the USA
- there was a rising tide of anti-war protest which had developed since 1965.

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

- the South Vietnamese Army could be strengthened in order to assume the role formerly played by the USA. The Tet Offensive had significantly damaged the VC and this was an opportunity to reinforce the South Vietnamese and avoid a domestic crisis in the USA
- the Doctrine was seen as part of a wider strategy adopted from 1969, particularly the Phoenix Program.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might suggest that political, strategic and diplomatic factors were inter-related and show how this integration of factors was underpinned by the Nixon Doctrine.

Question 3

- 06** 'The 1973 Paris Agreement was a triumph for the USA.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this view. (24 marks)

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

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and students are not obliged to refer to the material contained in this mark scheme. Any legitimate answer will be assessed on its merits according to the generic levels scheme.

Students should be able to make a judgement by balancing points which agree with the view that the USA emerged from the Paris Peace negotiations successfully and achieved their central objectives.

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

- the negotiations brought a ceasefire. This rapidly ended the continuing US casualty levels. This alone could be presented as a coup on the part of the US leadership and thereby enhanced Nixon's leadership credibility in the USA
- US POWs were to be released. Again this appeared as a major victory for the US leadership
- the leadership of South Vietnam, under President Thieu, was to remain in power. This had always been a US objective and it had been achieved.

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

- the settlement came at a price. Nixon promised billions of dollars of aid for the reconstruction of Hanoi
- Nixon had failed to get the withdrawal of the NVA from South Vietnam. He had failed to nullify the VC in the South
- Nixon had not won peace for Vietnam in 1973. The fighting continued. Bombing raids on Cambodia were carried out in August 1973
- ultimately the communists did take control of a united Vietnam in 1975 and the USA finally withdrew having failed to achieve its containment objectives and the preservation of South Vietnam's democracy.

Good answers are may conclude that the 1973 Peace negotiations were more apparent than real in terms of a US victory. Kissinger may have won a Nobel Peace prize but the ultimate outcome in 1975 revealed the real scale of the USA's diplomatic defeat in 1973.

Converting marks into UMS marks

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

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