



**General Certificate of Education
June 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 events which all examiners participate in and is the scheme which was used by them in this examination. The standardisation process 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 standardisation each examiner analyses a number of students' scripts: alternative answers not already covered by the mark scheme are discussed and legislated for. If, after the standardisation process, examiners encounter unusual answers which have not been raised 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 schools and colleges 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 schools and colleges 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

June 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 results of the Tet Offensive for North Vietnam. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

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

Indicative content

Note: This content is not prescriptive and 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 B opens with the view that the North ‘recorded great victories’. There are numerous indications in Source A that the Offensive was anything other than a defeat. Source A, for example, recognises the limitations of the North and the consequences of this. The North ‘suffered large losses’
- Source B suggests that numerous important South Vietnamese/American positions were successfully attacked. It notes that they ‘exerted our control for a definite period’. On the other hand, Source A says objectives were set ‘which were beyond our actual

strength'. There is a clear disparity between successful control and unattainable objective

- Source A says that the North was 'unable to hold on to the gains we made up in 1968' while Source B refers to the view that 'we liberated...1.5 million' people and the areas they inhabited. This suggests a permanency which is clearly challenged in Source A.

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

- although the VC was badly damaged the North still had its own national army which was largely intact
- there was an element of victory for the North and this tended to be recognised more by the Americans than by the North Vietnamese themselves.

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

- both sources agree that the damage done to the South and to the Americans was limited and insufficient, given the cost to the North. Source B refers to the North's inability to 'annihilate much of the enemy's forces'. Source A refers to the inequality between the two sides. From this follows the assessment that the North suffered heavy losses in the face of much stronger enemy resources
- Source B refers to the failure to win over the South Vietnamese army and encourage many of its members to change sides. The South Vietnamese troops remained loyal to South Vietnam, thereby depriving the North of additional military support. This lack of extra resources is referred to in Source A through the recognition that the North remained weak.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude. There are some significant differences. The primary issue is one of perception. The North interpreted the outcomes of the Tet Offensive very differently from the USA and tended to see it more as a lost opportunity rather than a victory.

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

How far was the Tet Offensive a defeat for the USA? (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 source underlines the view that Tet was a clear victory for the USA. This is particularly evident through the content of the final sentence in the source.
- **Source B:** This offers a balanced analysis of the outcomes of the Offensive. It clearly identifies areas of success for the North and therefore failures for the USA. Equally the opposite is also established. The Offensive did not represent a major resurgence of support for the North and it led to continued problems that stretched beyond 1968.
- **Source C:** Cronkite's reference to a stalemate is the key detail in this source. This clearly suggests that the USA did not achieve a well defined victory from the Tet Offensive. The third sentence in the source is particularly telling in terms of enabling students to use the source to evaluate the outcome for the USA.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting that the Tet Offensive was a defeat for the USA might include:

- Johnson refused to stand in the Presidential elections and his successor, Richard Nixon made it very clear that a withdrawal strategy was to be developed. This took the form of his Vietnamisation policy. These factors strongly suggest that the USA regarded Tet more as a defeat than a victory
- the events of Tet heightened the anti-war protest movement in the USA and thereby placed great political pressure on the US government. The negative political consequences of Tet reinforced the view that it was, in that sense, a political defeat
- the psychological aspects of the Tet Offensive on the mentality of US leaders and the US people is viewed as evidence of a defeat. Tet confirmed that the USA could not win militarily and that demanded a totally new approach. If Tet had not been a defeat then a new direction would not have been necessary
- Tet showed that containment could not work and that it was increasingly becoming a redundant policy. Tet redefined the foundations of US Cold War strategic and political thinking on the eve of the emergence of détente
- the Tet Offensive led to fierce media opposition, to US involvement. Most notably, Walter Cronkite voiced his view.

Factors suggesting that the Tet Offensive may not be viewed as a significant defeat for the USA might include:

- Tet did not force the USA to adopt an abandonment strategy. The USA remained in Vietnam and Nixon even extended the war into Cambodia and Laos. He adopted a major bombing strategy designed to strengthen the USA's negotiating position
- the VC as a fighting force was largely destroyed. Tet was a military disaster for the VC and therefore a resounding military victory for the USA
- the VC and the North lost all the territory they had gained in the offensive. Strategically the USA's military position was in no way weakened

- there was no popular uprising in the South that resulted from Tet. It was clear that the North had not achieved any significant propaganda victory. This could be linked to the comment made in Source B.

Good answers may conclude that on balance the Tet Offensive was a defeat rather than a victory. The significance of the defeat lies in the political outcomes that went on to drive strategic and military thinking in the longer term. In the immediate result of Tet was a military victory for the USA but beyond that it was a significant watershed in US policy making and that turns it into a defeat.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why the Vietcong was supported in South Vietnam in the years 1964 to 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 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 the Vietcong was supported in South Vietnam in the years 1965 to 1968.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the Vietcong was presented as both a nationalist and a communist movement. This enabled it to have a wide appeal amongst the peasant population. This became particularly significant as the Americans were seen as imperialist invaders who were perpetuating a regime in South Vietnam that was unpopular
- the Americans had failed to win the hearts and minds of the people. Their use of often indiscriminate violence against suspects and those who appeared to be helping them, alienated the people and moved them more firmly into the arms of the anti-US Vietcong forces
- the rural villages offered easy recruiting grounds for the Vietcong

- the Vietcong actively helped the rural peasantry. It provided aid and support and thereby developed a positive relationship with them, in contrast to that presented by the US and South Vietnamese army.

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

- the Vietcong acted as a central element of the propaganda campaign to win the hearts and minds of the South Vietnamese peasant population. This was a well-orchestrated and well-planned process
- the Vietcong was always prepared to use ruthless force against any amongst the South Vietnamese rural population who challenged it or sought to undermine its effectiveness. This was particularly evident during the Tet Offensive. Vietcong control and 'popularity' was partly the product of terror
- US support for the Strategic Hamlets programme had alienated many rural peasants and turned them into pro-Vietcong supporters

and some of the short-term/immediate factors:

- the growing escalation of US forces in South Vietnam between 1965 and 1968 was perceived negatively by the South Vietnamese peasantry. The US was seen as an invading army and the Vietcong presented itself as a defence force against this.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might link the rising unpopularity of the Americans with the growing support for the Vietcong. In turn, this was reinforced by the clear Vietcong strategy to use both kindness and terror on the South Vietnamese peasant population.

Question 2

- 04** 'The USA's involvement in Vietnam escalated in the years 1965 to 1968 because President Johnson was personally committed to achieving victory.'
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:

- Johnson believed that the North and the communists could be defeated by the overwhelming military superiority of the USA. This would enable the USA to force the North to the negotiating table and ensure that it would be negotiating for peace from a position of weakness. In Johnson's view victory was almost inevitable and the military escalation of the conflict was necessary and rational within that context
- Johnson was committed to fulfilling the Kennedy legacy, based as it was on the traditional US Cold War strategy of containment. This could only be achieved through a victory over communism in South Vietnam. Johnson was equally committed to the notion of the domino theory and therefore his absolute acceptance of the USA's Cold War strategy necessitated a military escalation and Johnson was in a position to oversee this approach
- Johnson knew that the South Vietnamese regime was weak both politically and militarily. Governments that had succeeded Diem lacked political strength and relatively little had been done to strengthen the South Vietnamese army. There was a real danger, as far as Johnson was concerned, that if the USA did not escalate its military presence in South Vietnam and 'Americanise' the war the North would overwhelm the South and thereby undermine containment and trigger the reality of the domino theory
- despite the ever increasing protest against the war in general and escalation in particular, Johnson continued to increase the USA military commitment throughout the years 1965 – 1968. He was the President and under the terms of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution he had the absolute final decision on the nature and scale of the USA's role in South Vietnam.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- there was considerable political pressure on Johnson, e.g. after the attack on Pleiku, Republicans became increasingly voluble in demanding victory. Johnson felt trapped and to some extent his course of escalation was the result of political pressure rather than his own unswerving commitment to escalation
- some argue that Johnson was a pawn in the hands of his leading advisers
- Johnson faced pressure from his senior military leaders especially General Westmoreland, the commander of American forces in Vietnam. He was constantly seeking greater troop numbers, the essence of escalation
- the Working Group set up to evaluate the USA's role in South Vietnam reinforced the importance of the USA preventing the domino theory becoming a reality. This was a powerful and influential body that Johnson succumbed to.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that Johnson was ultimately the driving force behind escalation even though he may have had initial reservations. However, he was not pushing the USA into escalation against a powerful anti-escalation lobby. Many others encouraged and pressurised Johnson to take the road of escalation.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the Watergate Affair contributed to the withdrawal of US forces from South 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 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.

This question focuses on the **contribution** of the Watergate Affair to the US withdrawal from South Vietnam. This withdrawal had been agreed in January 1973, subject to North Vietnamese compliance with the Paris Peace accords.

The contribution of the Watergate Affair was:

- Nixon anticipated a political crisis if Watergate became public knowledge and so was keen to pursue popular policy in Vietnam
- it prevented a US military response to North Vietnam's failure to maintain the accords
- it proved a distraction for Nixon who was thus prevented from further action over Vietnam
- the office of the President was weakened and in June 1973, Congress prohibited a military response by law, contrary to Nixon's wish for military involvement
- it put an end to clandestine decision making, and increased the importance of public opinion, which favoured withdrawal

- Nixon was, even after Paris demonstrably, not fully committed to the total abandonment of South East Asia but Watergate limited his power.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might emphasise the connection between personal reaction and president's public position or they might develop the underlying theme of the influence on public opinion.

Answers may argue that Watergate Affair made a limited contribution to the withdrawal of US troops. Other factors that contributed to US withdrawal may be rewarded if placed in this context, e.g. Vietnamisation had already established the principle that US land troops would be withdrawn – Watergate contributed to this direction of policy.

Question 3

- 06** 'In the years 1969 to 1973, President Nixon's policies showed that he was committed to protecting South Vietnam.'
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 Nixon's policies were focused primarily on protect democracy in South Vietnam against those which do not agree with the view.

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

- Nixon remained committed to a military struggle in Vietnam. This is seen through his policy of increasing bombing campaigns e.g. Linebacker. This suggests that the original motivation established by Kennedy and maintained by Johnson, viz prevent the spread of communism into the South and therefore in the US perception, protect democracy, continued
- he remained focused on developing a military strategy that was designed to deliver a stronger negotiating position for the USA against the North. The aim of this was to negotiate a peace settlement that would deliver the long term aims of the USA i.e. an independent, non-communist South Vietnam
- Nixon did not move the USA to a negotiating position when the terms demanded by the North were unacceptable. What made them unacceptable was the apparent capitulation by the USA implicit in some of the pre-negotiation stages
- Nixon extended his attempts to bring the North Vietnamese to negotiations by courting the influence of China. This reveals Nixon's commitment to realising a peace settlement based on protecting South Vietnamese democracy.

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

- Nixon was interested in protecting his own political future. He did not want to be seen as the President who lost the war. His own political interests overrode all other considerations, particularly those linked to the future of the people of South Vietnam
- Nixon committed the USA to the détente process that had begun to emerge by 1969. The USA participated in a series of détente negotiations, e.g. SALT I. This suggests that Nixon's commitment to fighting for democracy in South Vietnam against a communist threat was no longer relevant to the USA's greater global considerations
- Nixon was swayed by the anti-war protest movement and he saw this partly in terms of his own political survival, but also in terms of its longevity. The protest movement had been associated with Johnson and his unpopular policies and it was growing as the USA remained in Vietnam, particularly after Nixon increased US bombing commitments. Nixon was more focused on placating this movement than protecting South Vietnamese democracy from the threat of communism.

Good answers may conclude that Nixon's commitment to South Vietnamese democracy was more apparent than real and reiterate the evidence that may suggest this view. This may be tempered by the view that Nixon wanted to protect democracy but his ultimate objective was to protect himself and the wider national interests of the USA, particularly in a changing international relations context.

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