

A-LEVEL HISTORY

Unit HIS2Q: The USA and Vietnam, 1961–1975

Mark scheme

1041

June 2014

Version 1.0: Final

Mark schemes are prepared by the Lead Assessment Writer 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 associates 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 associate understands and applies it in the same correct way. As preparation for standardisation each associate 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, associates encounter unusual answers which have not been raised they are required to refer these to the Lead Assessment Writer.

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 from aqa.org.uk

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 2014

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 American military activities in the Vietnam War. **[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 refers to the US aim of regaining the 'loyalty and cooperation of the people'. Source A refers to 'payback time' and 'revenge'. Clearly these two aims are profoundly different in terms of the US attitude towards the South Vietnamese people

- Source B refers to the importance of making ‘a conscious effort...to minimize battle casualties amongst ordinary villagers’ while Source A indicates that at My Lai US troops freely shoot people they ‘weren’t supposed to shoot’
- Source B refers to leadership needing to be of a ‘high calibre’ and leadership that should display ‘restraint’. In contrast, Source A refers to the ‘inflammatory’ pep talk and the fact that no resistance was experienced by US troops but they continued to fire and thereby displayed no restraint. No orders to stop firing were issued by officers.

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

- the VC was very good at winning the support of villagers, either by persuasion or through the use of force. Many villagers in South Vietnam had little real choice about supporting the VC
- many South Vietnamese peasants were VC by night and farmers by day. The VC wore no formal uniforms. They were guerrilla fighters and depended on the aid and support of rural peasant farmers
- large numbers of VC were females and many relatively young children. It would not have been considered unusual for villagers of all ages to be active VC members
- the official US attitude was geared towards winning the hearts and minds of the South Vietnamese people. This strategy was a complete failure.

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

- both sources acknowledge that VC troops were often present in villages. Source A refers to the fact that the villagers of My Lai ‘supported the enemy’ while Source B indicates that ‘an area cannot be considered pacified until the VC activities have been... destroyed or removed’. The implication is that civilians may be damaged by this necessary process of removal
- both sources agree that the VC must be destroyed
- both sources agree that the VC can integrate into rural communities successfully. Source B refers to the fact that even when an area is occupied by US troops the VC can ‘remain active’. Source A implies that it is very difficult to identify VC amongst ordinary villagers, therefore everyone is to be treated in the same way – as an enemy of the USA.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that by 1968 US forces in Vietnam had become hardened to VC tactics and there was a growing sense of demoralisation amongst the troops. Commanders were becoming increasingly complacent about the lives of the rural population, for a wide range of reasons.

Question 1

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

How important were events such as the My Lai massacre in the growth of opposition to the war within the USA? **[24 marks]**

Target: A01(b), A02(a), A02(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:** the vivid description of the massacre provides powerful reasons why such an event would lead to loss of support.
- **Source B:** this defines the aims of the US military towards the people of Vietnam. It suggests that there was a political and a military benefit for the USA in protecting the people of Vietnam. The aim of the US army was to restore normality by minimising non-combatant casualties. This view recognises that in war zones civilians are inevitably vulnerable but must not be a primary target. The emphasis is upon identifying VC activists rather than assuming that all Vietnamese are activists. As such. The source provides reasons why Americans could support the war, but note that this was written in 1965.
- **Source C:** the source suggests reasons why both Radicals and workers opposed the war, but for very different reasons. Radicals were influenced by such massacres as at My Lai, but workers just thought the consequences of the war were not worth the deaths that were occurring.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the atrocities such as My Lai were important:

- such events were clearly important in student protest movements and in the alienation of Radicals who had, however, other reasons for supporting the war
- such atrocities were contrary to the aims and approach to war as set out by Westmoreland and undermined parts of the US army
- the mass bombing actions that began in 1965. The use of defoliants and chemical warfare were widespread and a fundamental part of the US approach. Civilians were going to be victims and the US knew this.

Factors suggesting other factors were important in the loss of support for the war:

- there was a vociferous and varied anti-war movement that flourished during this period. There was, for example, a clear link made between the violation of the civil rights of the Vietnamese and the violation of the rights of black Americans
- the war was widely publicised. The media had open access to the conflict and were able to film, for example, the impact of the war on civilians. There were numerous examples of civilians being brutalised by the actions of the USA
- the growing number of American deaths and casualties as Johnson escalated the war.

Good answers may conclude that the whilst atrocities such as My Lai heightened the loss of faith in the war effort and its aims, other factors were equally important, especially however, the growing lists of casualties which caused deep concern amongst even those who were indifferent to events of the war itself.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why President Kennedy ordered American military intervention in Vietnam in 1961. **[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 reasons why JFK ordered American military intervention in 1961. The army of South Vietnam received sufficient financial support for expansion to 170 000; an extra 1000 American military advisers were to be deployed. (This policy was secret because it infringed the 1954 Geneva Agreement). The intervention was motivated by the specific short-term policy decisions of a new president and by wider contextual causes of a perceived crisis in Vietnam requiring such intervention. Long-term factors applied directly to the decisions taken in 1961 should be rewarded appropriately but descriptive background will hold little value.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- *the crisis facing South Vietnam:* the situation in Vietnam had deteriorated sharply since 1954. The US was worried about the military and political weakness of South Vietnam and

saw an urgent need to prop it up. In many ways Kennedy was continuing policies inherited from Truman and Eisenhower

- *anti-Communism*: Kennedy was a committed anti-Communist and really believed that the US should be ready to take decisive action to confront Communism, in Asia as well as in Europe. (He wanted to impress Khrushchev after their clash over Berlin in June 1961)
- *Concern to look strong*: Kennedy was a new president (inaugurated in January 1961) who was afraid of being depicted as young, inexperienced and weak. He was determined to prove he could be at least as tough and decisive as the outgoing President Eisenhower
- *Advisers*: Kennedy's new administration included many 'hawks' who were convinced that the Domino Theory made it vital to defend South Vietnam; these hawks also persuaded Kennedy that a relatively small intervention in 1961 would be successful. They did not foresee any need for further major involvement in the future.

To reach Level 4, students will need to produce a developed explanation linking the reasons given. For example, they might comment on the inter-relationship of Kennedy's motive, linking together his anti-Communism and his wish to appear strong; or differentiate effectively between longer-term contextual factors and specific short-term factors such as the rise of the Viet Cong from 1960. Such a developed explanation of two reasons would be eligible for full marks if well done. *** NB Depth of comment and understanding may be shown in a separate conclusion; but it may also appear as a thread running through the whole answer.

Question 2

- 04** 'It was the failure of Kennedy's cautious policies towards Vietnam from 1961 that forced President Johnson to escalate the war in 1964.'
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.

The key quotation invites a balanced argument linking the policies of the Kennedy administration in the years 1961-1963 with the escalation of the war under Johnson in 1964. Candidates should be able to make a judgement by balancing evidence that supports the view given against evidence which does not. *** NB The focus of answers might vary according to the case being argued. Many

answers agreeing with the quotation will offer extensive evidence about the failure of Kennedy's policies in Vietnam because it was a key cause of what Johnson did later; those who see other, more important reasons behind Johnson's escalation may spend less time on 1961-63 and attempt an in-depth analysis of Johnson's motives in 1964.

Evidence supporting the view that Kennedy's actions and policies were a key reason for the escalation might include:

- the original intervention was a mistake. Kennedy failed to recognise the political corruption and the military weakness of South Vietnam under Diem
- an extra 25 000 soldiers in the army of the South and an extra 1000 US military 'advisers' was not nearly enough to swing back the balance of the war. The US badly underrated the Viet Cong and the potential military threat from the North (by 1964 the Viet Cong numbered 1000 000 compared with about 9000 in 1960)
- the Strategic Hamlets plan was badly flawed
- the Kennedy administration was distracted away from Vietnam by other pressing concerns, such as the Cuban Missile Crisis and the issue of civil rights
- Kennedy mishandled regime change and the removal of Diem; this led to chaos in the government of the South, not the strengthening that had been naively hoped for.

Evidence supporting a different view might include:

- the real causes of Johnson's policy of escalation were short-term, especially his reaction to the Gulf of Tonkin Incident
- Johnson stumbled into escalation by mistake. He really wanted to avoid a wider war and concentrate on his domestic policies for a 'Great Society'
- Johnson was misled by the advice of air force chiefs who believed that massive bombing campaigns would obviate the need for large-scale deployment of US ground troops

Good answers are likely to show depth of definition and differentiation. For example, they may conclude that the policies of Kennedy and Johnson were part of a continuity of policy and assumptions and that the death of JFK in November 1963 was not necessarily a major turning point.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why, in 1969, President Nixon decided to begin the phased 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.

Answers should include a range of reasons as to why President Nixon decided to begin the gradual withdrawal of US ground forces from South Vietnam early in his administration.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Nixon was committed to the achievement of 'peace with honour' for the USA in Vietnam. The phased withdrawal of US forces was seen as a fundamental element of achieving this
- Nixon knew that withdrawing ground troops would not mean a humiliating defeat for the USA. His strategy was to escalate bombing and attack Cambodia, the focal point of VC and North Vietnamese support and a key area on the HCM trail
- it was certainly possible to offer extensive support to the South Vietnamese army. The withdrawal from Vietnam did not mean the end of the USA's fundamental aim of protecting South Vietnam from communism. Nixon did not regard it as an abandonment of any political or practical aims.

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

- Johnson's strategy of military escalation had led to a growing casualty list since 1965. This had had a negative impact on US public opinion and fuelled the anti-war movement. The political consequences of escalation in the context of no sign of any US victory as a result of were not lost on the highly politically motivated Richard Nixon.

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

- the Tet offensive carried out by North Vietnam forces and the Vietcong had shown that the war had degenerated into a stalemate and that the USA's aggressive militarism in Vietnam had not worked. A new strategy that was not simply based on militarism was needed, and it was the Tet offensive that clearly underlined this reality for Nixon
- the wider international context by the late 1960s was suggesting that a change in US thinking on how to achieve its objectives in Vietnam was possible. Détente was emerging and it was clear to Nixon and his advisers that a less hostile relationship with the Soviet Union and China could be not only forged, but shaped into an effective tool to manage North Vietnam. Diplomacy rather than militarism was now possible as a route to success
- Johnson had commissioned the Clifford Report in 1968. This had strongly recommended that US strategy should focus on supporting the South Vietnamese government through economic aid in the form of training and equipment rather than being based on a direct US military presence.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might show how the impact of the media had profoundly influenced his thinking but he was also determined to develop a new strategy towards Vietnam because he knew that all the evidence suggested that a military victory was impossible. Nixon had to remain committed to 'peace with honour'.

Question 3

- 06** 'The 1973 Paris Agreement showed clearly that Nixon's policies in Vietnam 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.

The focus of this question is the success, or not, of Nixon's policies in Vietnam, from his inauguration in January 1969 to the signing of the 1973 Paris Agreement.

Evidence to support the view that Nixon failed might include:

- the terms agreed in 1973 were little different from what could have been negotiated in 1969; all Nixon achieved was unnecessary prolongation of the war
- Nixon's policies were devious and dishonest and he deliberately misled Congress – this worsened the US position and standing in the world
- the humiliating disaster of final collapse in 1975 was proof of failure
- by widening the war into Laos and Cambodia (and intensifying the bombing campaigns) Nixon ensured the deaths of many thousands of people, to no purpose
- Nixon's policies infuriated opinion at home and led to major flashpoints such as Kent State and the Pentagon Papers.

Evidence supporting the view that Nixon's policies were at least partially successful might include:

- there **was** a peace agreement in 1973; this represents success (especially as negotiations with North Vietnam were complicated and difficult, as was the relationship with his ally, South Vietnam)
- the phased withdrawal begun in 1969 **was** broadly successful, and helped convince both North and South Vietnam
- Kissinger was a brilliant negotiator
- rapprochement with China in 1972 was a master-stroke and was vital for completing the peace process
- US public opinion would not have accepted the 1973 deal in 1969.

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