



Markscheme

November 2015

History route 2

Higher level and standard level

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

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 B, were the consequences of the Treaty of Versailles for Germany? **[3]**

- Germany was no longer hemmed in by great powers as it had been in 1914 and was in a potentially stronger position;
- Germany was now surrounded by weaker states and/or the only great power that Germany now shared a border with was a weakened France;
- In 1919 Germany was temporarily weakened by its losses and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles;
- German industry was unaffected and/or German debts were internal.

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

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

- The victorious Allies have issued the peace terms and the rifle and bayonet imply that these will be enforced by military action;
- The Allies want the peace treaty to be on their terms;
- Germany shows surprise and/or alarm at the Allies' demands;
- The appearance of the figure representing Germany suggests that the country had not been weakened economically or militarily defeated.

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

2. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D about the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. **[6]**

For “compare”

- Both sources indicate that the Germans thought the Treaty of Versailles to be unfair;
- Both sources indicate that the Treaty was dictated by the Allies;
- Both sources highlight Articles 231 and 232 as being mainly responsible for German dissatisfaction at the Treaty of Versailles.

For “contrast”

- Source C states that the terms were harsh, whereas Source D states that as they were not all implemented the terms were not unduly harsh.
- Source C states that the reparations would be based on Germany’s capacity to pay, whereas source D states that reparations payments were beyond Germany’s capacity to pay;
- Source C is more critical of the Treaty, whereas Source D indicates that there was some flexibility in its implementation.

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 A and Source B for historians studying the Treaty of Versailles. **[6]**

Source A

- Origin: A letter from the leader of the German Peace Delegation Count von Brockdorff-Rantzau to the Paris Peace Conference President Georges Clemenceau on the Subject of Peace Terms, May 1919.
- Purpose: To express the German government's reaction to the terms of the peace settlement. To try to persuade the Allies to be more lenient.
- Value: It is from a member of the German government. It expresses the negative reaction of Germany to the peace terms. It is a letter directly to the French President.
- Limitations: It will be one sided and only limited to the German perspective. The tone is emotional and overstates German reaction in order to attempt to achieve a more reasonable settlement. As the letter was written before the Treaty was made public, it does not offer information about its implementation.

Source B

- Origin: An article by Alan Sharp, "The Big Four: Peacemaking in Paris in 1919" in *History Review* 2009. Alan Sharp is a Professor of International History.
- Purpose: To analyse the role of the Big Four in Paris in 1919 from a contemporary perspective.
- Value: It is an academic viewpoint. It has the benefit of hindsight.
- Limitations: The title suggests a focus on the process of peacemaking rather than a detailed study of the Treaty of Versailles.

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, to what extent were the Germans justified in claiming that the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were unfair? **[8]**

Source material

- Source A Sees the terms as very harsh and that it will be impossible for Germany to meet their demands. The terms will bankrupt Germany and were not what Germany expected.
- Source B Argues that Germany was not damaged as much as traditional historical analysis has shown and that Germany actually emerged stronger than it had been in 1914 as it was only temporarily weakened. German industry was untouched whereas France faced the costs of rebuilding her infrastructure and the repayment of external loans after the war.
- Source C States that Germany saw the Treaty as being unjust as it was dictated, enforced at the point of a gun and that it unfairly attributed war guilt in Article 231. MacMillan comments that Article 232 was based on Germany's capacity to pay, indicating that it was not unjust.
- Source D Germany saw the terms as unjust but, as they were modified when implemented, it could also be seen that the terms were not harsh.
- Source E The expression on the face of the figure representing Germany shows a surprised and/or alarmed reaction to the terms, which were imposed at the point of a bayonet. Germany's appearance indicates that it had the capacity to meet the Allied demands.

Own knowledge

In support of the statement candidates are also likely to make reference to Wilson's Fourteen Points and Germany's withdrawal from the First World War on the basis of signing the armistice. They could include details about the various terms of the Versailles settlement including territorial readjustments, mandated territories and disarmament. The prohibition of the Anschluss with Austria was a contentious point. The amount of reparations could also be included by many candidates; however please note that this was later determined by the Reparations Commission in 1921 and not in the Treaty of Versailles itself. In effect, Germany signed a "blank cheque" in relation to the amount to be paid that was considered to be unjust when the actual amount was made public. Candidates could mention that the terms of the Treaty of Versailles were not as harsh as those imposed by Germany on Russia at Brest-Litovsk in March 1918. Candidates could also argue that the Treaty of Versailles was not unfair on Germany by making reference to her responsibility in the events leading up to the outbreak of the First World War.

*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.*
