



MARKSCHEME

May 2013

HISTORY

Route 2

Higher Level and Standard Level

**Paper 1 – Peacemaking, peacekeeping –
international relations 1918–36**

*This markscheme is **confidential** and for the exclusive use of examiners in this examination session.*

*It is the property of the International Baccalaureate and must **not** be reproduced or distributed to any other person without the authorization of the IB Assessment Centre.*

For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate's work please contact your team leader.

1. (a) Why, according to Source D, was the occupation of the Ruhr “disastrous” for France? [3 marks]

- The United States and Britain led the committees set up in Paris in the aftermath of the crisis.
- With no commitment to the Treaty of Versailles, the United States became the mediators of its implementation.
- France surrendered independence and the rights conferred by the Treaty of Versailles.
- The League of Nations was now in charge of disarmament.

Award [1 mark] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3 marks].

(b) What is the message conveyed by Source C? [2 marks]

- Although Poincaré was determined to use armed force against Germany, he is warned that it will not produce the desired effects and cripple the German economy as a result of passive resistance.
- French policy drove Germany towards Bolshevism.
- The shabbily dressed image of Germany could imply she was unable, rather than unwilling to meet the payments.

Award [1 mark] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [2 marks].

2. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and D about the consequences of the occupation of the Ruhr.** *[6 marks]*

For “compare”

- They both show the crisis had negative consequences for France as it lost control over its own affairs.
- They both show that Britain and the US were critical of French actions.
- They both mention the involvement of the United States in European affairs.
- The both indicate that committees, such as Dawes, were set up to address the crisis.

For “contrast”

- Source D focuses on the consequences of the crisis which led to the involvement of the League of Nations, whereas Source B analyses the role of individual countries in the Ruhr crisis.
- Source B makes reference to the impact of the occupation of the Ruhr on France’s domestic policies while Source D focuses on the consequences for France’s international relations.
- Source B is more focused on the British response to the crisis while the main emphasis of Source D is upon the United States’ response.
- Source D is more critical as it centres on the negative consequences for France whereas Source B is more positive in its analysis of the outcome internationally.

Do not demand all of the above. If only one source is discussed award a maximum of *[2 marks]*. If the two sources are discussed separately award *[3 marks]* or with excellent linkage *[4–5 marks]*. For maximum *[6 marks]* expect a detailed running comparison/contrast. Award up to *[5 marks]* if two sources are linked/integrated in either a running comparison or contrast.

3. With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source A and Source E for historians studying the Ruhr Crisis (1923). [6 marks]

Source A

- Origin:** A public statement made by President Ebert of Germany on 10 January 1923 as a response to the French occupation of the Ruhr.
- Purpose:** To denounce the occupation as an act of aggression of France against Germany. To publicly classify it as a violation to the Treaty of Versailles. To encourage fellow citizens to resist the occupation.
- Value:** It is made at the time of the outbreak of the crisis. Coming from the president, it reveals Germany's official response to the crisis.
- Limitations:** As a public statement made at a time of great tension, the speech aims to motivate the Germans to resist the occupation. It is unlikely to provide an insight into French motivation.

Source E

- Origin:** An extract from a book published in 1991 by American historian Ronald E Powaski, who is a specialist in twentieth century history.
- Purpose:** To explain international relations, particularly the role of the United States in Europe in the first half of the twentieth century.
- Value:** The author is an expert in the field and his work can help put the Ruhr Crisis into a historical context and to understand the tensions between the nations and the role each of them played. The work has the benefit of hindsight and, because of the date of publication, access to a wide range of resources.
- Limitations:** The focus is on fifty years of the twentieth century and not explicitly on the Ruhr Crisis, which may only be a secondary topic of the book.

Do not expect all of the above. Ideally there will be a balance between the two sources, and each one can be marked out of *[3 marks]*, but allow a *[4/2 marks]* split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of *[4 marks]*. For a maximum of *[6 marks]* candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations in their assessment.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, evaluate the impact of the Ruhr Crisis (1923) on international relations between 1923 and 1929. [8 marks]

Source material:

Source A: French policy violated the Treaty of Versailles and increased Franco–German tensions; it threatened Germany’s stability.

Source B: It increased tension between Britain and France over the treatment of Germany and deepened British fears of a dominant France. The United States became more involved in European affairs and, approached by Britain, promoted the Dawes Plan to assist the economic recovery of Germany. France was left at the mercy of the United States and Britain. The crisis led to the revision of German reparations in 1924 and to the Treaty of Locarno in 1925, so it improved international relations.

Source C: The cartoon shows tension between France and Germany. Also, it illustrates the risk that the occupation of the Ruhr might push Germany into the arms of Bolshevism.

Source D: The aftermath of the occupation led to the dominance of Britain and the United States in international meetings; the United States became the mediator of the Treaty of Versailles which they had not ratified; the League of Nations became more involved in disarmament; France lost power.

Source E: The Source suggests that the Ruhr Crisis had a negative impact on international relations. Britain and the United States’ condemnation of France soured relations with France; the impact of the occupation on Germany threatened German democracy and the post-war international settlements. This instability also made Europe more vulnerable to Bolshevism. On the other hand, the Ruhr Crisis pulled the United States into greater involvement in Europe in order to receive repayment of war debts.

Own knowledge

Own knowledge could include: additional information about the greater involvement of the United States in European affairs; the appointment of Gustav Stresemann in 1923 leading to Dawes, Locarno and the beginning of negotiations in 1928 resulting in the Young Plan. Germany’s admission into the League of Nations in 1926, the renewal of the Treaty of Rapallo with the Treaty of Berlin in 1926 and the German signing of the Kellogg-Briand Pact in 1928 all indicated Germany’s re-emergence as a major power but her dependence upon the Dawes and the Young Plan made her precariously dependent upon the United States. The crisis changed attitudes to the Treaty of Versailles and opened up opportunities for revision. Candidates could also mention French support for separatist movements in the Palatinate and the Rhineland; additional material on Britain’s policy of “benevolent passivity” and its impact on relations with France, such as British views about the need to ensure an economically and democratically viable Germany, in contrast with French policy to make Germany pay at any cost

Do not expect all the above and accept other relevant material. If only source material or own knowledge is used the maximum mark that can be obtained is **[5 marks]**. For maximum **[8 marks]** expect argument, synthesis of source material and own knowledge, as well as references to the sources used.