



Rewarding Learning

**General Certificate of Secondary Education
2025**

History

Unit 2: Outline Study

[GHR21]

THURSDAY 5 JUNE, MORNING

**MARK
SCHEME**

General Marking Instructions

Introduction

Mark schemes are intended to ensure that the GCSE examinations are marked consistently and fairly. The mark schemes provide examiners with an indication of the nature and range of candidates' responses likely to be worthy of credit. They also set out the criteria which examiners should apply in allocating marks to candidates' responses. The mark schemes should be read in conjunction with these general marking instructions.

Assessment Objectives

Below are the assessment objectives for GCSE History.

Candidates must:

- AO1** demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of the period studied;
- AO2** explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts including continuity, change, cause, consequence, significance, similarity and difference;
- AO3** analyse, evaluate and use sources (contemporary to the period) to make substantiated judgements, in the context of historical events studied; and
- AO4** analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations (including how and why interpretations may differ) in the context of historical events studied.

Quality of candidates' responses

In marking the examination papers, examiners should be looking for a quality of response reflecting the level of maturity which may reasonably be expected of a 16-year-old, which is the age at which the majority of candidates sit their GCSE examinations.

Flexibility in marking

Mark schemes are not intended to be totally prescriptive. No mark scheme can cover all the responses which candidates may produce. In the event of unanticipated responses, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement to assess the validity of answers. If an answer is particularly problematic, then examiners should seek the guidance of the Supervising Examiner.

Positive marking

Examiners are encouraged to be positive in their marking, giving appropriate credit for what candidates know, understand and can do rather than penalising candidates for errors or omissions. Examiners should make use of the whole of the available mark range for any particular question and be prepared to award full marks for a response which is as good as might reasonably be expected of a 16-year-old GCSE candidate.

Awarding zero marks

Marks should only be awarded for valid responses and no marks should be awarded for an answer which is completely incorrect or inappropriate.

Types of mark schemes

Mark schemes for questions which require candidates to respond in extended written form are marked on the basis of levels of response which take account of the quality of written communication.

Other questions which require only short answers are marked on a point for point basis with marks awarded for each valid piece of information provided.

Levels of response

Questions requiring candidates to respond in extended writing are marked in terms of levels of response. In deciding which level of response to award, examiners should look for the 'best fit' bearing in mind that weakness in one area may be compensated for by strength in another. In deciding which mark within a particular level to award to any response, examiners are expected to use their professional judgement. The following guidance is provided to assist examiners:

- **Threshold performance:** Response which just merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the bottom of the range.
- **Intermediate performance:** Response which clearly merits inclusion in the level and should be awarded a mark at or near the middle of the range.
- **High performance:** Response which fully satisfies the level description and should be awarded a mark at or near the top of the range.

Quality of written communication

Quality of written communication (QWC) is taken into account in assessing candidates' responses to all questions that require them to respond in extended written form. These questions are marked on the basis of levels of response. The description for each level of response includes reference to the quality of written communication.

Instructions for examiners:

For questions which are assessed using three levels of response the following QWC descriptors are to be used:

Level 1

Writing communicates ideas using a limited range of historical terminology and shows some skills of selection of material, but the response lacks clarity and organisation. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms accurately and shows some skills of selection and organisation of material. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3

Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely selected historical terms, and organises information clearly and coherently. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

For questions which are assessed using four levels of response the following QWC descriptors are to be used:

Level 1

Writing communicates ideas using a limited range of historical terminology and shows basic skills of selection of material, but the response lacks clarity, structure and organisation of ideas. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms mostly accurately and shows some skills of selection and organisation of material in a structured way. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms accurately and shows skills of selection and organisation of material. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar mostly accurately.

Level 4

Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely selected historical terms, and organises information clearly and coherently. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Section A

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

The detail given in this mark scheme is for **examiner guidance** and candidates are not expected to cover **every** point suggested.

- 1 What does **Source A** tell us about the reasons why the USA became involved in the Korean War?

Target AO3: Analysis of sources.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Level 1 ([1])

Answers at this level will include information extracted from Source A or paraphrased from Source A.

Level 2 ([2]–[3])

Answers at this level will begin to analyse the content of Source A and make use of it to show why the USA became involved in the Korean War. For example, in Source A it states that ‘Asia is the gateway to Europe for the USSR’ and that ‘South Korea is an area of great importance to the security of the USA in Asia’.

Level 3 ([4])

Answers at this level will fully analyse the content of Source A to show why the USA became involved in the Korean War.

For example, Source A tells us that ‘Asia is where the communists have chosen to spread their power and influence.’ Source A goes on to state ‘if we lose this war against communism in Asia, the fall of Europe is next’. Finally, the source says ‘the power and importance of the USA is at stake’.

Any other valid point

[4]

4

- 2 (a) **Source B** and **Source C** give different views about the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis, 1959–1962.

Explain **two** ways in which these views differ.

Target AO4: Analysis of interpretations.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Award **[1]** for identifying a valid difference between Source B and Source C

Award **[2]** for identifying a valid difference between Source B and Source C with supporting evidence

Apply above criteria for **each** way

Any **two** ways:

- Source B describes the USA's actions as 'threatening' Cuba and the USSR. Source C differs from this and refers to the 'aggressive' actions of the USSR
- In Source B Castro refers to how the USA organised the 'Bay of Pigs invasion'. Source C makes no reference to this
- In Source C there is reference to Castro announcing 'he had become a communist'. Castro makes no reference to this in Source B.

Any other valid point

(2 × [2])

[4]

- (b) Explain **one** reason why the views in **Source B** and **Source C** are different.

Target AO4: Analysis of interpretations.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Award **[1]** for identifying a valid reason why the views in Source B and Source C are different. For example, the views in Source B and Source C are different because they are written by different people who hold different views about the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Award **[2]** for identifying a valid reason why the views in Source B and Source C are different with supporting evidence. For example, the sources are different because they are different interpretations of the causes of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Source B is by Fidel Castro, leader of Cuba at the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis who is anti-American and blames the Cuban Missile Crisis on the USA and Source C is the view of an American politician who defends the West's role in the Cuban Missile Crisis based on intelligence of Soviet missile sites in Cuba.

Any other valid point

[2]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

6

- 3 How convincing is the view in **Source D** about the reasons for the USA's involvement in the Vietnam War by 1968?

Explain your answer using **Source D** and **your contextual knowledge**.

Target AO4: Analyse, evaluate and make substantiated judgements about interpretations.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Level 1 ([1]–[2])

Answers at this level will show a limited response which will only focus on the content of Source D. Little attempt will be made to address the reasons for the USA's involvement in the Vietnam War by 1968. Candidates may simply extract information from Source D which outlines one view about the reasons for the USA's involvement in Vietnam.

Level 2 ([3]–[5])

Answers at this level will show limited knowledge or understanding of the view in Source D or challenge it. Candidates may only refer to the view that the USA believed they were 'fighting a necessary war against the Vietcong'. Candidates can access the top mark in this level if they attempt to analyse and use Source D and some contextual knowledge to reach a limited judgement about how convincing they find the view.

Level 3 ([6]–[8])

Answers at this level will show a clear understanding of the view in Source D about the reasons for the USA's involvement in Vietnam by 1968. At the top end of this level candidates will use their contextual knowledge to clearly analyse and explain how convincing they find the view. A substantiated judgement will be reached based on contextual knowledge and understanding.

Answers may include some of the following:

- In Source D the British historian says that 'the USA became involved in events outside Europe to contain communism and prevent countries from falling under communist control.' This could be seen as convincing as the USA believed in the domino theory and the fall of China to communism in 1949 convinced the USA to intervene when there was any danger of a communist takeover
- In Source D the British historian says that 'the USA believed that South Vietnam was...rich in natural resources'. Source D goes on to say that the USA saw themselves as the 'world's policeman'. This could be seen as convincing as Vietnam was a useful satellite to the USA, rich in tin, rubber and tungsten. The USA had a long-standing commitment to contain communism as a result of the Truman Doctrine of 1947 and increasingly saw themselves in the role of the 'world's policeman'
- The historian in Source D refers to how 'in the Vietnam War the USA believed they were fighting a necessary war against the Vietcong'. This is convincing as Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson believed in the significance of Vietnam as the cornerstone of the free world and both Kennedy and Johnson were concerned about the growing number of guerrilla attacks by the Vietcong and their tactics in Vietnam
- In Source D the historian states that 'the USA needed an easy foreign policy success after the Bay of Pigs incident and the Cuban Missile Crisis'.

This may be seen as unconvincing because whilst the Bay of Pigs invasion made Kennedy look inexperienced, candidates may argue that aspects of the Cuban Missile Crisis were a propaganda success for the USA due to Kennedy's policy of brinkmanship.

Any other valid point

[8]

AVAILABLE
MARKS

8

- 4 How far do you agree with the view in **Source D** that “the USA became involved in events outside Europe to contain communism and prevent countries from falling under communist control”?

In your answer you **must** use **Sources B, C and D** and **use information of your own**.

Target AO1, AO2, and AO4: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features, explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts: causation, analyse and evaluate interpretations.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Level 1 ([1]–[4])

Answers will offer a vague general account of the content of Sources B, C and D with little attempt to address the question and limited analysis of only one or two sources. Little attempt will be made to address the view in Source D or the views in Sources B and C. There will be limited or no own knowledge to support the answer and no judgement reached or the judgement will be unsubstantiated.

Level 2 ([5]–[8])

Answers will begin to use the content of Sources B, C and D and describe and analyse the views given in at least two of the sources. There will be some limited own knowledge. An attempt will be made to address the view in Source D that “the USA became involved in events outside Europe to contain communism and prevent countries from falling under communist control.” A limited judgement will be made.

Level 3 ([9]–[12])

Answers at this level will show an understanding of the different views given in Sources B, C and D. Candidates will begin to explain the view in Source D that “the USA became involved in events outside Europe to contain communism and prevent countries from falling under communist control.” They will include some of their own knowledge to support their answer and further explore the reasons for the different views about why the USA became involved in events outside Europe. Responses of this nature can access the top end of this level. A developed judgement will be reached.

Level 4 ([13]–[16])

Answers at this level will show a clear understanding of the different viewpoints in Sources B, C and D and offer valid explanations for these. Candidates at the top end of this level will make a substantiated judgement based on their own knowledge and understanding.

Answers may include some of the following:

- Source D is the view of a British historian who argues in Source D that “the USA became involved in events outside Europe to contain communism and prevent countries from falling under communist control.” The historian argues that the USA ‘saw themselves as the ‘world’s policeman’ and had a duty to do what was right to help’. The USA was committed to the containment of communism following the Truman Doctrine. As in Korea, the USA saw the possibility of the domino theory coming into play; if all of Vietnam fell to communism, then neighbouring countries might follow suit. Source D

states that 'the USA believed that South Vietnam was a key ally against communism, rich in natural resources and therefore they had to help'.

President Johnson was not prepared to allow the fall of South East Asia and did not want it to fall to communism as China had previously in 1949

- Source B is the view of Fidel Castro, who in 1985 was still the leader of Cuba. Castro has a different view. He refers to how the USA 'was threatening us' and that Cuba was worried about a US 'attack'. He disagrees with the view in Source D and states that 'the USA started this crisis by blockading Cuba, organising the Bay of Pigs invasion and cutting off our trade links'. Castro began to nationalise industries in Cuba and this worried the USA. As US hostility towards Cuba grew, trade between the two nations declined. Castro was deeply concerned by US attempts to overthrow him and turned to the USSR for assistance. Castro identifies that the crisis was the USA's 'fault' and suggests that this was not about containing communism, but rather to show American strength
- Source C offers a view from an American politician who has a pro-American stance on why the USA became involved in Cuba. He presents a range of factors about the Cuban Missile Crisis. He states that 'Castro had overthrown the previous leader' and 'Cuba's growing closeness to the USSR worried the USA and they had to act'. The USA largely regarded Cuba as part of its sphere of influence and regarded Cuba as being part of America's backyard. Cuba's proximity to the USA, its previous trading relationship, and the fact that Castro had overthrown the dictator Batista who the USA supported were all factors as to why the USA became involved. Source C goes on to state that 'in 1962 American intelligence confirmed Soviet nuclear missile sites in Cuba'. This worrying development in the crisis triggered the USA to become involved in Cuba
- Overall candidates could argue that the USA did become involved in "events outside Europe to contain communism and prevent countries from falling under communist control" but that this was not the only reason. Concerns over a nuclear arms race, the desire for raw materials and ensuring the USA retained its sphere of influence were also factors in explaining why the USA became involved in events outside Europe.

Any other valid point

[16]

16

Section A

34

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

Section B

AVAILABLE
MARKS

5 Describe **two** reasons for the invasion of Iraq in 2003.

Target AO1: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Able to identify **one** reason with limited description **[1]**

For example, Saddam Hussein's support for Al-Qaeda.

Able to identify **one** reason with detailed description **[2]**

For example, both George W. Bush and Tony Blair claimed that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Whilst the UN inspection team in Iraq found no evidence of WMDs, the British and American governments refused to accept the results and ordered the invasion of Iraq.

Apply criteria to each reason

Any other valid point

(2 × [2])

[4]

4

- 6 (a) Why and how did the USA and the USSR become involved in tensions over Germany and Berlin up to 1961?

Use the following guidelines in your answer. You **must** also use information of your own.

- Yalta and Potsdam, 1945
- Berlin Blockade and Airlift, 1948–1949
- Disagreements over Berlin, 1959–1961

Target AO1 and AO2: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features to explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts: causation/consequence/significance.

Award **[0]** for no rewardable material

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level may use only one of the guidelines and may fail to address the question, offering only a descriptive narrative which will contain inaccuracies.

Writing communicates ideas using a limited range of historical terminology and shows basic skills of selection of material, but the response lacks clarity and organisation. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([6]–[11])

Answers will use at least two of the guidelines, perhaps with some omissions, but will offer a more informed explanation and some analysis of why and how the USA and the USSR became involved in tensions over Germany and Berlin up to 1961.

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms mostly accurately and shows some skills of selection and organisation of material in a structured way. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([12]–[17])

Answers will use all the guidelines and include more detail to provide a clear explanation and analysis of why and how the USA and the USSR became involved in tensions over Germany and Berlin up to 1961.

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms accurately and shows skills of selection and organisation of material. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar mostly accurately.

Level 4 ([18]–[22])

Answers will use all the guidelines and will provide a clear and full explanation of why and how the USA and the USSR became involved in tensions over Germany and Berlin up to 1961. Analysis will be focused on the question, with accurate detail throughout.

Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely-selected historical terms, and organises information clearly and coherently. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Answers may include some of the following:

AVAILABLE
MARKS

Yalta and Potsdam, 1945

- During wartime the mistrust and suspicion between the USA and the USSR had been suppressed due to the common enemy of Nazism
- At Yalta in February 1945 it was agreed that Germany had to pay for all damage especially to the USSR. Germany was to be demilitarised and divided into four zones to be controlled by the four allies (USA, USSR, Britain and France). The capital, Berlin, 100 miles inside the USSR zone, was also to be divided into four sectors
- The USSR would be allowed to influence Eastern Europe and Stalin promised to hold democratic elections after the war to allow the people of Eastern Europe to choose their own governments
- At Potsdam in July 1945 it was decided that the USSR could take 25% of industrial equipment from western zones of Germany as reparations in return for providing supplies of food, fuel and raw materials. Suspicions of both the USA and USSR at Potsdam led to increased tension which was to develop into the Cold War

Berlin Blockade and Airlift, 1948–1949

- The USSR wanted Germany to pay reparations for damage and deaths in World War Two, while the USA wanted to rebuild the German economy. The USSR feared that a revived Germany might be a threat to its interests. Tension increased in 1948 because of a plan by the West to introduce currency reform
- In June 1948 Stalin blocked off all roads and railway links between West Germany and West Berlin. The Americans saw this as a test of the Truman Doctrine and were determined to help West Berlin. The Berlin Blockade was the first open confrontation between the USA and the USSR in the Cold War
- The USA was determined to stay in West Berlin. With the support of Britain and France, it decided to supply the people of West Berlin with food and fuel. The airlift lasted 324 days, with up to 13 000 tons supplied each day
- Stalin did not shoot down the allied planes as he did not want to be seen as the aggressor and risk a nuclear attack. Stalin realised the determination of the USA and the West and lifted the Blockade in May 1949

Disagreements over Berlin, 1959–1961

- During the 1950s the standard of living improved faster in the West than in the East and the contrast was most apparent in Berlin. Between 1949 and 1961, more than two million East German refugees used Berlin as an escape route to the 'Golden West'. The Soviet Union feared that this exodus of mainly educated young people would undermine communist control in East Germany
- Khrushchev was concerned because West Berlin was a centre for western espionage, enabling the West to gather information about activities behind the Iron Curtain
- Previously Khrushchev attempted to force the West to withdraw by threatening to give East Germany control of access points to the city; however, he failed. Further talks took place between the USA and the USSR in June 1961, where Khrushchev demanded that the West hand over West Berlin to the Soviets. Kennedy refused to do so, and Khrushchev decided that further action needed to be taken

- On 13 August 1961, East German soldiers ended all free movement from East to West Berlin. Soon a concrete wall divided the city. The wall became a symbol of the division of communism and democracy at the heart of the Cold War

Any other valid point [22]

- (b) How did relations change between the USA and the USSR in the period from 1968 to 1985?

Use the following guidelines in your answer. You **must** also use information of your own.

- Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev Doctrine, 1968
- Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, 1979
- Changing relations between the USA and the USSR, 1980–1985

Target AO1 and AO2: Demonstrate knowledge and understanding of the key features to explain and analyse historical events and periods studied using second-order historical concepts: change/continuity/significance.

Award [0] for no rewardable material

Level 1 ([1]–[5])

Answers at this level may use only one of the guidelines and may fail to address the question, offering only a descriptive narrative which will contain inaccuracies.

Writing communicates ideas using a limited range of historical terminology and shows basic skills of selection of material, but the response lacks clarity and organisation. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with limited accuracy.

Level 2 ([6]–[11])

Answers will use at least two of the guidelines, perhaps with some omissions, but will offer a more informed explanation and some analysis of how relations changed between the USA and the USSR in the period from 1968 to 1985.

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms mostly accurately and shows some skills of selection and organisation of material in a structured way. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with some accuracy.

Level 3 ([12]–[17])

Answers will use all the guidelines and include more detail to provide a clear explanation and analysis of how relations changed between the USA and the USSR in the period from 1968 to 1985.

Writing communicates ideas using historical terms accurately and shows skills of selection and organisation of material. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar mostly accurately.

Level 4 ([18]–[22])

Answers will use all the guidelines and will provide a clear and full explanation of how relations changed between the USA and the USSR in the period from 1968 to 1985. Analysis will be focused on the question, with accurate detail throughout.

Writing communicates ideas effectively, using a range of precisely-selected historical terms and organises information clearly and coherently. Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy.

Answers may include some of the following:**Czechoslovakia and the Brezhnev Doctrine, 1968**

- Economic problems in Czechoslovakia led to political protest in early 1968 and a new communist leader, Alexander Dubček, took office. He introduced economic reforms and a relaxing of political control while remaining loyal to the USSR. He called his reforms ‘socialism with a human face’
- Dubček’s reforms worried the USSR. Brezhnev, the leader of the USSR in 1968, was concerned that other countries in Eastern Europe would demand greater freedom and the USSR’s control would be undermined
- On 20 August 1968, 400 000 troops from the USSR and four other Warsaw Pact countries invaded Czechoslovakia ‘to restore order’. The Czechs used ‘passive resistance’ and Dubček was forced to resign in April 1969. The USA protested but made no attempt to help Czechoslovakia
- The Brezhnev Doctrine in November 1968 stated that any country in Eastern Europe that introduced economic or political reform would be invaded by Warsaw Pact countries. It marked an important statement of the USSR’s determination to maintain control of Eastern Europe. The new Czech leader, Husák, was obedient to Soviet control. The Brezhnev Doctrine saw relations deteriorate between the USA and the USSR

Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, 1979

- During the 1970s, détente led to an improvement in relations between the USA and USSR. However, détente ended with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. The USSR believed that its influence was under threat as a new leader Hafizullah Amin seized power. Afghanistan had valuable gas fields, which the USSR wished to exploit
- On 25 December 1979, Soviet forces invaded and by the New Year they had reached Kabul, occupied the President’s palace, killed Amin and established a ‘puppet ruler’, Babrak Karmal, in his place
- The invasion was condemned by the USA, and although it did not cause a ‘hot’ war between the superpowers, between 1981 and 1987, the Americans supplied \$3.2 billion of guns, missiles and money to the Mujahideen
- The war lasted for ten years. The USSR had 125 000 troops, with tanks and helicopter gunships but the Mujahideen ambushed Soviet supply convoys, shot down their helicopters and then hid in the mountains or amongst the population. The Soviet forces attacked villages, but they could not defeat the guerrilla forces

Changing relations between the USA and the USSR, 1980–1985

- By the 1980s the Cold War descended to new depths of tension but as the 1980s progressed there were new heights of cooperation, which in the 1960s seemed unthinkable
- Relations remained poor when Ronald Reagan became President of the USA in 1981. He condemned the USSR as an ‘evil empire’ and increased spending on weapons
- In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev became the new leader of the USSR. He realised that the USSR could no longer afford to compete with the USA in weapons production. The USSR’s economy needed reform and this would mean cuts in spending on defence
- This led to an improved relationship with the West as Gorbachev adopted a new approach in foreign policy, stating his willingness to negotiate with the USA

Any other valid point

[22]

Section B

Total

**AVAILABLE
MARKS**

22

26

60