

---

**HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)**

**2134/02**

Paper 2 International Relations and Developments

**October/November 2019**

MARK SCHEME

Maximum Mark: 40

---

**Published**

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the October/November 2019 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level components and some Cambridge O Level components.

---

This document consists of **7** printed pages.

**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:**

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:**

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:**

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:**

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (however; the use of the full mark range may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:**

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p><b>Study Source A. Why was this source published at this time? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question.</b> 0</p> <p><b>Level 1: Describes details from the source but no reason for publication.</b> 1 <i>e.g. The source shows a room full of empty chairs.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2: Interprets the cartoon's message or context but not expressed as a reason for publication.</b> 2 <i>e.g. The Disarmament Conference was a failure because there was nobody there.</i></p> <p><b>OR Responses which give a reason but misinterpret the cartoon.</b> <i>e.g. The cartoon was published to show Britain supported Germany.</i></p> <p><b>Level 3: Uses the general context as a reason for publication</b> 3 <i>e.g. The cartoon was published because the Disarmament Conference was going on at the time.</i></p> <p><b>Level 4: Uses the message as a reason for publication.</b> 4–5 <i>e.g. The source was published at this time to show that Germany had dropped out of the Conference and Britain was trying to run the conference alone. The cartoonist wanted to show that the Conference was going to fail.</i></p> <p><b>Level 5: Uses the specific context as a reason for publication.</b> 6 <i>e.g. This source was published because Germany had just dropped out of the Conference because Hitler had come to power. He was not interested in disarmament and wanted to rearm Germany to make it great again. Other countries are also missing from the table. For instance, Japan had quit the League and Conference in February 1933 (nine months before the cartoon).</i></p>	6

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p><b>Study Sources B and C. Do these two sources show that the USA changed its mind about the Disarmament Conference? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question.</b> 0</p> <p><b>Level 1: Writes about the source(s) but doesn't address change of mind.</b> 1</p> <p><b>Level 2: Yes or No based on unexplained reference to the provenance OR changed / not changed mind with no valid explanation.</b> 2 <i>e.g. No, the US had not changed its mind as both are American sources.</i></p> <p><b>Level 3: Yes or No based on the content of one source (inconsistency in Source C).</b> 3 <i>e.g. Yes, the US has changed its mind because in Source C he says the conference achieved a lot but also there were issues it didn't address.</i></p> <p><b>Level 4: Compares sources to show evidence that the US has changed its mind</b> 4–5 <i>e.g. These sources do prove that the US has changed its mind. Source B is negative about the Conference and shows that the US will not cooperate unless it gets its way. On the other hand, Source C seems to take a more positive line and discusses the achievements of the Conference.</i></p> <p><b>Level 5: Compares sources to show evidence that the US has not changed its mind.</b> 6 <i>e.g. Both sources agree that there are things which haven't been achieved so the US hasn't totally changed its mind.</i></p> <p><b>Level 6 Answers which evaluate Source C or Source B without comparison of the sources (comparing to contextual knowledge).</b> 7 <i>e.g. Source C does not show that the US has changed its mind about the Conference. Swanson was the US representative at the Conference and he therefore wants to show its achievements in a positive light.</i> <i>e.g. These sources do prove the US has changed its mind. At the end of WWI the US withdrew into an isolationist position.</i></p> <p><b>Level 7: No, based on comparison of sources and evaluation of the purpose of Source C.</b> 8 <i>e.g. The US hasn't changed its mind. Although the sources disagree about how effective the conference has been, they both suggest it has failures and weaknesses. However, Swanson will feel obligated to take a positive stance.</i></p>	8

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p><b>Study Source D. How trustworthy is this source? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question.</b> 0</p> <p><b>Level 1: Describes the source.</b> 1 <i>e.g. The source is about Germany walking out.</i></p> <p><b>Level 2: Makes an assertion about trust but no valid explanation.</b> 2 <i>e.g. The source is trustworthy because it is from Germany.</i></p> <p><b>Level 3: Trustworthy or not based on undeveloped provenance / common sense reasoning.</b> 3 <i>e.g. This source is trustworthy as the German Foreign Minister was there at the time and knows what was going on.</i></p> <p><b>Level 4: Trustworthy or not based on what he says.</b> 4 <i>e.g. This source can be trusted as the Foreign Minister says that other countries haven't disarmed so Germany is leaving.</i></p> <p><b>Level 5: Trustworthy or not based on evaluation of what he says (by cross reference to specific knowledge or another source).</b> 5–6 <i>e.g. This source can't be trusted as Germany had other reasons for leaving the Conference. Hitler came to power in Germany early in 1933 and he had promised to make Germany great again by rebuilding its military strength and tearing up the military restrictions placed on it by the Treaty of Versailles.</i></p> <p><b>Level 6: Trustworthy or not based on the purpose of Source D.</b> 7 <i>e.g. This source can't be trusted as the real reason why Germany wanted to leave the Disarmament Conference. It shows how they used the behaviour of the other powers as an excuse to justify their actions. They use the failure of the world powers to disarm as their reason for leaving. The German Minister made this statement to make the world believe that Germany was a peace-loving nation, but this was clearly not the truth.</i></p>	7

Question	Answer	Marks	
4	<b>Study Source E. How useful is this source as evidence about disarmament? Explain your answer.</b>	7	
	<b>Level 0: No response or response does not address the question.</b>		0
	<b>Level 1: Writes about the source but does not address utility.</b> <i>e.g. The source tells us about the success of the Disarmament Conference.</i>		1
	<b>Level 2: Useful / not useful based on provenance / common sense.</b> <i>e.g. The source is/is not useful because it was written by someone who is being awarded a peace prize. He is bound to support disarmament.</i>		2
	<b>Level 3: Useful / not useful based on content.</b> <i>e.g. This source is useful because it shows that there was still some hope for disarmament.</i>		3–4
	<b>Level 4: Useful / not useful based on cross reference to knowledge / other sources.</b> <i>e.g. The source is not useful because what it says is not true. Germany had no intention of returning to the peace conference and was already making plans to expand its army.</i>		5–6
	<b>Level 5: Not useful based on the motive / purpose of the speech.</b> <i>e.g. The source is not useful because Henderson was the author. He was Chairman of the Disarmament Conference and so was unlikely to say that it was a failure when he was winning the major prize for promoting peace. He is still trying to win people over to support disarmament. His comments about Hitler are hopeful rather than being based on solid facts and therefore his comments are not useful as they are not credible.</i>		7

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p><b>Use <u>all</u> the sources. ‘The Disarmament Conference was a complete failure.’ How far do these sources support this judgement? Explain your answer.</b></p> <p><b>Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question. 0</b></p> <p><b>Level 1: Writes about the topic / question without valid source use. 1–3</b></p> <p><b>Level 2: Valid use of the sources to support <u>or</u> challenge the judgement. 4–6</b></p> <p><i>e.g. Source A supports the judgement because the British chairman is on his own. He couldn’t make the Conference work if the other countries, such as Japan, were not present to agree.</i></p> <p><i>Source B supports the judgement because it shows that the US and Britain refused to give up their fleets to defend their overseas territories.</i></p> <p><b>Level 3: Valid use of the sources to support <u>and</u> challenge the judgement. 7–9</b></p> <p><i>Level 2 plus:</i></p> <p><i>e.g. Source C challenges the judgement because it shows that biological and bacteriological weapons have been banned.</i></p> <p><i>Source E suggests that the Conference could still work and that the Germans could be persuaded to return under certain conditions.</i></p> <p><b>Up to three additional marks will be available for developed evaluation of the sources.</b></p> <p>Source use must be reference to a source by a letter, by provenance or by direct quote.</p> <p>There must be examples from source content. There must be an explanation of how this supports/ does not support the statement.</p>	12