

Markscheme

May 2016

History route 2

Higher 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) What, according to Source A, were the problems facing the negotiators at Paris? [3]

- Reparations violated pre-armistice agreements with Germany and were disastrous.
- Austria-Hungary had fallen apart and self-appointed national governments ruled the states.
- The populations of central Europe were “mixed” and pure self-determination was impossible.
- Negotiators didn't anticipate the need for a Confederation in order to resolve economic and political problems.

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

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

- The Austro-Hungarian Empire was divided territorially and Hungary was separated from Austria.
- The population of Austria was reduced to 6 million people.
- Candidates may refer to the change of size of Austria-Hungary as representative of a reduction of its power and influence.
- The peace terms were seen as a necessary medicine that would make Austria feel better. Candidates may refer to the comment “you'll feel better now” as reflecting the view of the author.

Award [1] for each valid point up to a maximum of [2].

2. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and D about the impact of the Paris Peace Treaties.

[6]

For “compare”

- Both sources claim that the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire contributed to the creation of a weak Austria.
- Both sources argue that self-determination was difficult to apply in Central Europe.
- Both sources claim that the peace settlement caused political and/or economic problems.

For “contrast”

- Source D seems to indicate that the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was a result of the peace settlement whereas Source A states it had fallen apart before the Conference met.
- Source A considers the Paris treaties to have been the closest to an ethnographic/cultural map that Europe had ever had whereas Source D doesn't seem to agree that this was the case, for example, areas of Czechoslovakia had large numbers of German and Polish people living in them.
- Source A claims that the most disastrous economic effects of the Treaty of Versailles were reparations whereas Source D considers that the unstable economic situation was caused by a combination of the Treaty of Versailles and the four other treaties.
- Source D is critical of the effects of the Peace Treaties for Europe whereas Source A suggests that the new Slavic states made some gains from the new territorial arrangements.

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

3. With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source B and Source C for historians studying the successes of the Paris Peace Treaties.

[6]

Source B

- Origin: A speech by the Australian Prime Minister to Australian troops in Paris in April 1919.
- Purpose: To express his dissatisfaction at the delays in the Paris Peace Conference. To anticipate to his nationals that the Treaties may not bring about the expected results.
- Value: Hughes is a participant in the negotiations taking place in Paris. He anticipates some of the reasons why the Treaties may not be entirely successful in resolving the issues created by the war. The source provides a perspective from outside Europe.
- Limitations: The speech was delivered before the Treaties were concluded so its usefulness in understanding their success is limited. He may have tried to justify the fact that, as representative for Australia, he played a limited role in the decisions taken.

Source C

- Origin: An extract from a book written by Winston Churchill in 1929.
- Purpose: To give his view of the war and the peace settlement.
- Value: He was an eyewitness to the events and held various positions both during and after the war. The book was written with benefit of hindsight and is an in-depth study of the period.
- Limitations: He may have tried to justify his actions and decisions or those of the British government. It was written at a time when events were still developing.

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], but allow a [4/2] split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of [4]. For a maximum of [6] candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, examine the view that the settlement achieved at the Paris Peace Treaties (1919–1920) was the best that could have been reached. **[8]**

Source material

- Source A The circumstances in which the settlement was reached are described as very complex: the breakup of the Austro Hungarian Empire; economic issues; the urgency for reconstruction. The inclusion of reparations was disastrous. The populations of central Europe were mixed. Despite this, the treaty created the map of Europe that respected cultural issues the most and granted freedom to the new Slavic states.
- Source B Circumstances were very complex: the expansion of Bolshevism; limited faith in a satisfactory Treaty; the delay in drafting the Treaty; secret negotiations taking place.
- Source C The settlement did not solve many points of friction. Better solutions could only have been implemented had there been greater commitment from Britain, France and the US but the exhaustion from war prevented this. Neither Central nor Southern Europe were perfectly divided but they generally followed self-determination.
- Source D The limited success of the Treaty of Versailles, combined with the failure of the other Paris Peace Treaties, caused instability in the 1920s and 1930s. They created weak countries such as Austria and Hungary. Self-determination was difficult to apply in Central and Eastern Europe and the creation of new states created conflicts. These regions did not serve as a proper balance to either Germany or the USSR.
- Source E Although the Peace Treaties could have been seen as a remedy at the time, the source shows that they had a negative impact on Austria.

Own knowledge

There could be further material on the impact of the collapse of the German, Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires; details of specific minority issues (for example, the South Tyrol; the Polish corridor; the Sudetenland); the formation of Poland; the clashes in the aims of the peacemakers; US refusal to ratify the treaties; the cost of war and reconstruction; internal unrest in Hungary that prevented Trianon from being signed until 1920; nationalist opposition to Sèvres in Turkey leading to the Greco-Turkish War and the end of the Sultanate: the creation of the League of Nations to enforce the treaties.

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