



**General Certificate of Education
June 2013**

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 © 2013 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 2013

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 attempts to bring about peace in 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 suggests that the North Vietnamese simply rejected US peace moves. Source A suggests that the North Vietnamese wanted a political solution but it was US military aggression that prevented this rather than North Vietnamese non-cooperation and intransigence
- Source B refers to 'the sincerity of our offers to make peace...' while Source A refers to the 'sham peace tricks.' Both are references to the USA

-
- Source B refers to more aggressive military action by the USA while Source A demands the opposite from the USA.

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

- both sides had relatively intractable positions. The North wanted a united and communist Vietnam while the Americans were committed to containment and the preservation of a democratic, and independent, South Vietnamese state
- the fact that Johnson continually escalated the US military presence in Vietnam suggested to the North that there was no real sincerity in any US peace diplomacy
- the VC was expanding and increasing its military power. This corresponded to escalation by the North.

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

- Source B recognises that the US may have created mistrust and misinterpretation in the minds of the North Vietnamese about its peace proposals. Source A reflects this in the second sentence, which clearly shows mistrust. Source B also says 'the sincerity of our peace overtures has been questioned'
- both sources refer to a possible escalation of the conflict. The final sentence of each source reflects this similarity.

In making a judgement about the degree of difference, students may conclude that neither side was fully committed to a negotiated peace. Each side developed its propaganda but there was no consensus between them.

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

How far was the North Vietnamese government, in the years 1964 to 1968, responsible for the escalation of the war in 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 some limitations to Hanoi's responsibility. The primary cause of the continuance of the conflict lies with the USA. Hanoi is merely responding to US aggression. If the aggression ended then so would Hanoi's need to react to it. However, the source also implies a long term commitment by Hanoi. There is no real sense of compromise in the position Hanoi takes. There is a sense of ultimatum and this suggests that Hanoi is a key player in the continuance, and therefore the escalation, of the war.
- **Source B:** This very much suggests a real reluctance on the part of the USA to escalate the war. If anything the opposite is the case. The US focuses on its attempts to develop peace agreements, which have been undermined by Hanoi. Gradualism was the initial US position and this has only shifted due to Hanoi's intransigence.
- **Source C:** This suggests that the responsibility lies with the USA and its insistence on all negotiations happening on its terms. There is also the suggestion in this source that Hanoi was equally non-compliant and was determined to establish a communist government in Saigon. Both sides, therefore, have a measure of responsibility for the escalation.

From students' own knowledge:

Factors suggesting the North Vietnamese government was responsible for the escalation of the war might include:

- Hanoi developed the Ho Chi Minh trail as a major logistical supply route. Its strategy enabled a guerrilla army to operate effectively in South Vietnam. There was no indication that the North would limit the expansion of the role of the Ho Chi Minh trail and thereby limit the escalation of the war
- there was no clear willingness by Hanoi to enter into negotiations
- Hanoi strategy was based, in part, on winning the hearts and minds of the South Vietnamese people. This acted as a recruitment strategy and heightened anti-American feeling. The VC ensured that their ranks would always have enough strength to effectively oppose the US
- guerrilla tactics prevented an outright conventional victory for either side. This left the US with no alternative and viable strategy for success. This outcome was the responsibility of Hanoi
- Hanoi sought the help of external support, especially from China. This not only enabled it to perpetuate the war but it further confirmed the urgency of protecting South Vietnam from the threat of communism in the mind of the USA.

Factors suggesting the war was escalated due to reasons other than the role of Hanoi might include:

- Johnson was absolutely committed to containment. The conflict in Vietnam was a test of containment and one that he could not afford to lose. Johnson became more sucked into escalation, almost as a gambler tries to recoup his losses by more gambling
- Johnson was convinced of the strategic importance of military ground forces. He was certain that the USA's military might would prevail and that a reversal of that policy would simply constitute a waste of resources already expended
- the threat from the North continued and the South Vietnamese forces remained inadequate. The US believed that it had to remain and to strengthen its resources because there was no other way to achieve success i.e. the long term preservation of a democratic South Vietnam
- Johnson did escalate the war. The figures for US military growth are clear. In addition, there were bombing campaigns which further fuelled the escalation because they didn't fully achieve their objectives.

Good answers are likely to/may conclude that the primary responsibility lies with the USA although there was a clear culpability on the part of Hanoi. Neither side developed sufficient commitment to compromise necessary for anything other than escalation to take place.

Question 2

- 03** Explain why the Vietcong adopted guerrilla warfare tactics during the conflict in 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 the Vietcong used guerrilla tactics in the conflict in South Vietnam.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- the VC did not have the military capability of the USA and its South Vietnamese allies. It could not embark on conventional warfare with any realistic hope of success. Guerrilla warfare meant it was playing to its strengths and American weaknesses
- the model of revolutionary warfare or warfare focused on nationalist causes was very much based on guerrilla tactics. It had been used in other conflicts such as in Africa and other parts of SE Asia
- the VC was manned by recruits from rural areas. It was possible to some extent to absorb rural farmers into a VC fighting force and use their local knowledge very effectively against the US enemy. It made perfect sense for a man to be a farmer by day and a VC 'freedom fighter' by night

- guerrilla warfare was relatively cheap economically. It was effective without the need to pour in vast amounts of economic support. This was an important factor for the VC, who had some foreign aid but could never compete with the economic might of the USA.

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

- the Americans never really adapted their military strategies to guerrilla warfare. Throughout the war US casualties rose and the great majority of these were the consequence of VC guerrilla tactics. In a sense, US tactics determined VC tactics. Guerrilla warfare worked and the USA had only limited effectiveness in its response to it throughout the war
- guerrilla warfare could be easily supported through the Ho Chi Minh trail. This provided light weight military support but it would have been very difficult to supply the heavy material needed for a conventional form of warfare.

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

- the Kennedy administration had adopted counter-insurgency tactics and this had encouraged a VC response through guerrilla style tactics
- the Strategic Hamlets Programme encouraged the use of guerrilla tactics because this was the only effective way to counter that strategy.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might explore the economic disparity between the VC and the USA and emphasise the pragmatic nature of guerrilla warfare. The USA contributed as much to the use of guerrilla warfare as did the rationale to use it made sense to the VC.

Question 2

- 04** 'Support for the Vietcong amongst the South Vietnamese people was due to its role as a nationalist movement.'

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 strong nationalist spirit amongst the VC. Many South Vietnamese joined the VC because they wanted to fight against American imperialism in Vietnam
- the VC was fighting Diem until his assassination. There was considerable anti-Diem feeling, particularly over the lack of reform and the nepotism that Diem led. The link between Diem and the USA was a powerful factor in encouraging South Vietnamese peasants to support the VC. Diem, with US support, had introduced the widely unpopular Strategic Hamlets programme
- the VC was perceived as a force of freedom fighters by many South Vietnamese peasants. It was made up of purely Vietnamese people and this made it easy for the peasants to identify with
- the VC political programme called for the creation of a democracy, the implementation of rural reforms. In addition to this there was a focus on developing a national and democratic culture, a national army devoted to the defence of the people, and the reunification of the two Vietnams. These policy aims attracted widespread support because they all offered economic progress and freedom.

Evidence which disagree(s) might include:

- the VC was willing to use terror and extreme aggression against any individuals who refused to cooperate with it or who cooperated with the South Vietnamese government or the US military. There are many examples of VC terror tactics which made the people compliant through fear
- the VC had a strong communist element. Its close links with North Vietnam and China indicate the communist factor. Communism appealed to many South Vietnamese peasants because it implied wealth redistribution and a focus on the interests of all the people. It implied equality and this attracted the rural peasantry
- the VC offered considerable help to the South Vietnamese peasantry. It showed a sensitivity as well as ruthlessness. There was almost a 'Robin Hood' factor about it. This was a key factor in its ability to win the 'hearts and minds' of the Vietnamese people, unlike the approach of the South Vietnamese army and the US military
- the actions of the South Vietnamese army and the US military often alienated the people. Widespread destruction was carried out against innocent civilians. All this did was to force the people into the arms of the VC. The Americans turned the VC into the defenders of the people.

Good answers are likely may conclude that the appeal of the VC was wide ranging in its nature. No one single factor in itself was sufficient to ensure support. The political and military message and tactics of the VC did draw support but so did the negative influences of the Americans.

Question 3

- 05** Explain why the USA did not withdraw all of its personnel from South Vietnam until 1975.
(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 USA did not withdraw from Vietnam once it had agreed to the Paris Peace Accords.

Students might include some of the following factors:

- Nixon promised to maintain full economic and military aid to South Vietnam. This military aid necessitated some US presence to ensure its effective use, as did the economic package. This was part of Nixon's post-war reconstruction package for South Vietnam
- in Cambodia the US airforce continued its attacks against the communists. This was to give the South Vietnamese army time to establish its military control. The airforce needed to be in South Vietnam in order to achieve this
- détente had created better US-China and US-USSR relations. This reduced the pressure on Nixon and the USA to withdraw quickly, although most of the US military were withdrawn.

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

- Nixon was still hoping for some form of peace with honour for the USA. A US presence would have deterred the North from taking direct action against the South in the immediate post-Paris period. The US had agreed to leave but they wanted to retain some token presence in order to preserve their original objective, an independent South Vietnam.

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

- Nixon didn't finally resign from office until August 1974. Up till that point there was no authority able to sanction US withdrawal. Only from the point of this event did that withdrawal become possible
- in early 1975 the North carried out major assaults against the South and its military forces. By the end of March, South Vietnam was in a state of military collapse. There was no way the US could effectively intervene to protect it by this point. A month later the last US forces were evacuated from what was clearly a hopeless military position by that point.

To reach higher levels, students will need to show the inter-relationship of the reasons given. For example, they might suggest that a US presence was a device to achieve an outcome that US militarism had failed to achieve. The aim was to establish an economically and militarily secure South Vietnam while the North had achieved one of its objectives, the military withdrawal of the US, and was thereby apparently more compliant. This US objective finally failed. Students may also go on to suggest that the US Congress was not sufficiently proactive in ordering the removal of the US presence in all its forms, not merely in the military form.

Question 3

- 06** 'The USA lost the war in Vietnam because of the US media.'
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 media played a central role in causing the US to withdraw from Vietnam and in the process apparently lose the war against other factors which caused the US to lose the war.

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

- the Cronkite factor was significant as a populist influence on US anti-war public opinion, particularly after the Tet Offensive
- the war was exposed to a liberal tradition of journalism. The press, and more especially TV, were accused of deliberately showing graphic scenes of South Vietnamese peasants suffering at the hands of the US military
- the media reported news, but it also reported its own opinion. It reinforced the US public's understanding that the US military had not achieved any death blow against the enemy and that the end was in sight. It also reported and commented on the failure of the US military to win the hearts and minds of the South Vietnamese people
- Nixon's deception in the attacks on Cambodia and Laos were fuel for the media anti-war stance.

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

- much media coverage was relatively supportive of the war before Tet. The TV and press adopted a soundly patriotic and anti-communist position. Public opposition was not shaped primarily by media influence at that point
- events such as My Lai and the Kent State University massacres heightened the public's growing opposition to the war
- Congress increasingly took the view that the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution was misplaced and the powers of the President to wage war must be curbed
- Nixon introduced the beginnings of withdrawal, and therefore ultimate defeat, with the Vietnamisation programme. This was the result of military and political factors rather than primarily the result of media pressure
- militarism failed and for the US the only viable option was a negotiated compromise which could only have one outcome for the US.

Good answers may conclude that although the media had a key role in the US public's perception of the war and that perception was increasingly anti-war, the key factors happened beyond the influence of the media or the impact of public opinion. Ultimately the failure to ensure a clear military victory meant the US had lost.

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