



MARKSCHEME

November 2014

HISTORY

Route 2

Higher Level and Standard Level

**Paper 1 – Peacemaking, peacekeeping –
international relations 1918–1936**

6 pages

*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 C, was Austria dissatisfied with the peace settlement? [3 marks]

- It wanted to be regarded as a new state rather than as a successor state.
- Union with Germany was banned.
- It was left in a financially weak position.
- It was cut off from its former empire (and was concerned about the impact of this on German-speaking minorities).
- It was powerless to do anything about the decisions being made.

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

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

- That the result of the negotiations may lead to an explosion of discontent, possibly causing world revolution.
- That each of the members is smoking and the spark that will ignite the explosion can come from any member.
- That France is seen as the nation most likely to cause the explosion as her pipe is closest to the gunpowder.
- The decisions seemed to be taken by the victorious nations and/or the central position of Uncle Sam indicates that US had a leading role in the conference.
- The five powers, sitting drinking tea, seem unaware of the consequences of their decisions.

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 C about the Paris Peace Treaties.** *[6 marks]*

For “compare”

- Both sources indicate that the peace settlement was heavily criticized.
- Both sources mention the redistribution of territory in Europe.
- Both sources indicate that opposition to the treaties was based on the terms of the treaties.

For “contrast”

- Source B indicates that the peace settlements were criticized by both the victors and the vanquished whereas Source C only includes criticisms from Austria and Hungary.
- Source B is more positive as it maintains that the terms were lenient, being neither unfair nor ruthless, whereas Source C is more critical and considers the terms to have been extremely harsh and punitive.
- Source B focuses on the procedures and the Peace Treaties in general whereas Source C identifies specific terms and their consequences on specific countries.
- Source B maintains that the consequences of the settlement were fair whereas Source C maintains that the decisions made at the Conference would result in weaker nations and that they would be faced with major financial and economic difficulties.

Do not demand all of the above. If only one source is discussed award a maximum of *[2 marks]*. If 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 D for historians studying the Paris Peace Treaties.** [6 marks]

Source A

Origin: An extract from *The Economic Consequences of the Peace*, by JM Keynes, a member of the British delegation at the Paris Conference in 1919.

Purpose: To inform a wider audience of the decisions that were made at Paris.

Value: The views expressed are those of a participant at the Conference and the book is written in the same year that many of the peace settlements were made. Keynes is an expert in economics and his judgments will, therefore, be based on his own area of expertise.

Limitations: Not all of the final decisions had yet been made, particularly in regard to the amount to be paid in reparations, so Keynes's criticisms may be premature. Keynes is expressing his personal view about the terms of the settlement and this did not reflect the British government view. As a British participant at the conference, Keynes's perception of events could be narrow and, as an economist, focused on economic factors.

Source D

Origin: An extract from Raymond Poincaré's opening speech to the delegates at the Paris Peace Conference, 18 January 1919.

Purpose: To welcome delegates to the Conference and also to indicate to the participants some of the principles that should be applied when determining the terms of the settlements.

Value: Poincaré was President of France in 1919 and had a clear understanding of the difficulties facing the peacemakers. He had been President of France since 1913; so he had been in office for the duration of the war. It represents the official position of the French government.

Limitations: This was only the opening session of the conference and it appears as if Poincaré was trying to influence decisions made at the conference; however the source offers no evidence whether this had any effect on the Peace Treaties.

Do not expect all 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.

4. **Using the sources and your own knowledge, analyse how successfully the peacemakers dealt with the challenges facing them upon negotiating the treaties of St Germain, Trianon and Neuilly.** *[8 marks]*

Source material

Source A: Maintains that “the opportunity was missed” and that “great damage was done” indicating that the economic conditions of nations were not considered.

Source B: While indicating that it was not the terms of the settlement that were unfair it does clearly state that there was considerable concern raised by the nations about the procedures that were followed and the principles that were ignored. It also states that the settlement was criticized by both victors and vanquished and this was a challenge to its implementation.

Source C: Discusses specific concerns raised by countries. Austria’s claims to be a new state were ignored. She was cut off from her former empire and union with Germany was banned. Hungary lost territory but was also seen as being a threat to Czechoslovakia, Romania (Rumania) and Yugoslavia. This source indicates the problems of competing nationalist claims and the formation of defensive alliances.

Source D: Is positive about the intentions behind the Conference and invites the participants to respect nations taking into account their “ethnic and religious minorities”. It also exhorts the Conference to respect and ensure freedom and material wellbeing for those peoples who will be affected by its decisions. It identifies some of the challenges facing the peacemakers such as ethnic and religious issues.

Source E: Shows that it is the victors who will be determining the future shape of the world and that the Central Powers and other nations are not party to the decisions thus implying that the rights of smaller nations will be ignored. It also shows that, if the negotiators are not careful, a world revolution might explode as a consequence of their decisions.

Own knowledge

Own knowledge could include the terms of these specific treaties and a discussion of how they affected the rights of the nations involved. These could incorporate some of the following factors: Yugoslavia was created out of Serbia, Montenegro, Dalmatia, Slovenia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia and Northern Macedonia; Czechoslovakia was created from Bohemia, Moravia, Slovakia and Ruthenia; the South Tyrol, Trentino, Trieste and Istria were awarded to Italy, which was dissatisfied at the settlement; Greece was given Western Thrace; Poland received Galicia; Hungary lost two-thirds of its territory. Specific mention could be made of the reparations payments each country had to pay and the economic and personal costs to small and large nations that resulted from the transfer of territories. Candidates may point out that it was an impossible task to reconcile the conflicting claims of different nations and the different perspectives of leading statesmen. It was also difficult for the statesmen to apply the principle of national self-determination.

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.