
HISTORY (MODERN WORLD AFFAIRS)

2134/02

Paper 2 International Relations and Developments

For Examination from 2015

SPECIMEN MARK SCHEME

1 hour 15 minutes

MAXIMUM MARK: 40

This document consists of **4** printed pages.

Notes

- The full mark range will be used as a matter of course. Marks must not be deducted for inaccurate or irrelevant material. Half-marks will not be used.
- Levels of response criteria are used for questions where a hierarchy of answers is possible. Each answer is to be placed in the level that best reflects its qualities. It is not necessary to work through the levels.
- In all levels, provisionally award the highest mark and then moderate according to the qualities of the individual answer.
- Arguments need to be supported with evidence. Lots of fact/dates are not required.
- No set answer is looked for to any question. The examples given in the mark scheme are indicative only and are not intended to be exhaustive or prescriptive. They are given only as examples of some responses/approaches that may be seen by an examiner.

1 What can we learn from the source about the relationship between the Soviet Union and Cuba during the Cuban Missile Crisis?

Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question. [0]

Level 1: Uses surface features of the cartoon only. [1–2]
e.g. Castro and Khrushchev are in a classroom.

Level 2: Makes inference without support. [3–4]
e.g. In the relationship between the Soviet Union and Cuba, the Russians are dominant.

Level 3: Inference about relationship with support from the cartoon. [5–6]
e.g. The Soviet Union and Cuba are friends but the Russians (Khrushchev) are dominant because he is teaching Castro about where the missiles could go by using a map.

2 How far do these sources agree about the Cuban Missile Crisis?

Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question. [0]

Level 1: Writes about the sources but no comparisons. [1–2]
e.g. President Kennedy is talking about the missiles.

Level 2: False matching: identifies content that is in one source but not the other. [3]
e.g. The Russian military had independent authority but it doesn't mention this in Source B.

Level 3: Compares the sources for agreement or disagreement. [4–5]
e.g. They agree because in Source B it says the Russians had nuclear strike capability and in Source C it states that the Russians possessed thirty six nuclear warheads.

OR

e.g. They disagree because Source C says that no Washington decision-maker knew that the Soviets could launch an attack but in Source B Kennedy knows they can because he knows about the sites.

Level 4: Compares the sources for agreement and disagreement. [6–7]

3 How useful is this source in explaining the aims of the United States in Indochina?

Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question. [0]

Level 1: Answer which fails to deal with utility. [1]
e.g. The United States is called imperialist.

Level 2: Undeveloped provenance. [2]
e.g. It is not useful because Ho Chi Minh is biased.

Level 3: Useful because of what it tells us or does not tell us. [3–4]
e.g. It tells us about the imperialist aims or it does not tell us about other aims.

Level 4: Useful and not useful because of what it tells us and does not tell us. [4–5]
e.g. Level 3 plus: But it is not useful because it doesn't tell us that another of their aims was to stop communism.

Level 5: Not useful because it is unreliable, explained. [6]
e.g. Minh is talking to the Press and the interview is going out world wide so he would try to exaggerate the U.S. role to get support for himself and his hopes for a united Vietnam under communism.

Level 6: Level 5 plus it is nevertheless useful. [7]
i.e. As evidence of how Ho Chi Minh wishes to represent the Indochina conflict.

4 How surprised are you by what this source says?

Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question. [0]

Level 1: Answers which fail to express surprise or lack of surprise. [1]
e.g. the U.S. made lots of policy announcements in the 1950s.

Level 2: Identifies what is/is not surprising but without explanation. [2]
e.g. Yes I am surprised he did not want them to go to war.

Level 3: Surprise or lack of surprise explained by common sense reasoning. [3]
i.e. Valid explanation but not using contextual knowledge or other sources.
e.g. I am not surprised he doesn't want to get Americans killed because wars are horrible.

Level 4: Surprise based on cross-reference to other sources. [4–5]
e.g. I am surprised he doesn't want to send troops to Indochina because in Source D it says America's aim was to get control of Indochina.

Level 5: Surprise or lack of surprise supported by cross-reference to contextual knowledge. [6–7]
e.g. I am surprised because we know that after the Gulf of Tonkin President Johnson did send American combat troops into Vietnam.

OR

I am not surprised because Johnson was not President at the time and he was representing the views of Americans who did not want to send troops into another overseas war after Korea.

Level 6: Both aspects of level 5. [8]

- 5 'The Soviet Union was responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War.' How far do these sources support this judgement?

Level 0: No response or response does not answer the question. [0]

Level 1: Writes about globalisation of the Cold War but without reference to the sources or uses sources without valid explanation. [1–3]

Level 2: Use of source content at face value to support or question the judgement. [4–6]
e.g. No, the sources say the USA was responsible. In Source D Ho Chi Minh says that the USA is openly interfering in Indochina.

Level 3: Use of source content at face value to support and question the judgement. [7–9]
e.g. As Level 2 plus: However in Source A, Khrushchev is clearly controlling the deployment of missiles when teaching Castro, so therefore the Soviet Union was responsible.

Level 4: Developed evaluation of source content to support and question the judgement. [10–12]

e.g. As Level 3 plus: But Source A is a cartoon from an American newspaper. American newspapers often blamed the Soviet Union for the Cold War and cartoons tend to exaggerate to make a point.