



MARKSCHEME

November 2012

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) What, according to Source B, was the decision of the Council of the League of Nations concerning the Åland Islands? [3 marks]

- Finland gains sovereignty over the Åland Islands;
- The guarantees will achieve their purpose if agreed to by both Finland and Sweden;
- If no agreement is possible the Council of the League of Nations will enforce the guarantees;

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]

- The fact that Wilson is offering the olive branch represents him as the main driving force behind the idea of a the League of Nations;
- Wilson is entrusting the dove to be able to fulfil the aims of the League;
- The olive branch is very heavy/thick symbolizing the difficulties facing the new League of Nations in maintaining collective security in the light of Wilson's idealism;
- The dove is concerned about being able to please all members of the League Nations.

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

2. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources D and E about the Corfu incident.** **[6 marks]**

For “compare”

- Both sources agree that Mussolini received compensation;
- Both sources state that Mussolini proclaimed Corfu as a victory;
- Both sources indicate that negotiations were difficult.

For “contrast”

- Source E states that Greece appealed to both the League of Nations and the Conference of Ambassadors, whereas Source D only mentions Greece referring the dispute to the Conference of Ambassadors.
- Source E indicates that, despite claiming a victory, Mussolini had been defeated as he did not gain control of Corfu whereas Source D states that the fascist regime got away with aggression;
- Source E shows that Britain wanted the dispute to be resolved by using collective security, whereas Source D states that Britain and France did not want to resort to collective security.

End-on description of both sources would be worth up to **[3 marks]** if the comparative element is only implicit, and **[4 marks]** with excellent explicit linkage. If both sources are used with a good running linkage of both comparison and contrast award a maximum of **[4-5 marks]**. For the maximum of **[6 marks]** expect a detailed, comprehensive, running, comparison and contrast. If there is only either comparison or contrast award a maximum of **[4 marks]**.

3. **With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source A and Source D for historians studying principles of collective security and early attempts at peacekeeping (1920–1925).** [6 marks]

Source A

- Origin: A speech by President Woodrow Wilson, 25 September 1919, Colorado, USA.
- Purpose: Wilson is trying to gain support for the League of Nations in the USA. To explain how collective security was to be maintained.
- Value: Shows Wilson’s attitude to world affairs and his determination to find an alternative way of achieving mutual protection for all nations. It shows that Wilson was committed to the principles and mechanisms of the League of Nations.
- Limitations: Wilson is very idealistic and he is trying to get support for his own creation. He may not be acknowledging some of the inherent weaknesses that the proposal entailed.

Source D

- Origin: Extract from a book by Aristotle A Kallis, *Fascist Ideology: Territory and Expansionism in Italy and Germany, 1922–1945*, 2000.
- Purpose: To explain the role of ideology in Italy and Germany’s expansionist policies between 1922 and 1945.
- Value: Written in 2000 and therefore has hindsight. It is an academic treatment of the subject.
- Limitations: Does not focus specifically on the League of Nations’ policy of collective security and gives a very one-sided view of the Corfu incident.

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.

4. **Using the sources and your own knowledge, discuss the effectiveness of principles of collective security and early attempts at peacekeeping (1920–1925).** *[8 marks]*

Source material

- Source A: This source is rather idealistic. It considers that nations will never act in their own self-interest and will never go to war. It shows that collective security was a complicated process which limited the effectiveness of the League of Nations.
- Source B: This source shows that, in the case of the Åland Islands, the League of Nations, implementing collective security, made proposals that helped to resolve the dispute.
- Source C: This source indicates that the League may be ineffective in establishing its policy of collective security because of the different interests of members and the magnitude of the task.
- Source D: This source shows that there is some confusion of jurisdiction between the League of Nations and the Conference of Ambassadors. It also shows that, in the case of Corfu, negotiations were long and difficult and the League was ineffective in dealing with Mussolini's aggression. The British and French preferred to resort to traditional diplomacy which undermined the policy of collective security.
- Source E: The effectiveness of the League was challenged by the fact that Greece appealed to both the League and the Conference of Ambassadors and because the Italians questioned the jurisdiction of the Council. This source argues that collective security was effective as Britain and other members supported the League in its actions against Mussolini and did not ignore their obligations to the League of Nations.

Own knowledge

Own knowledge could include: other disputes between nations in which collective security became involved. These could include Fiume, Memel, the Greek–Bulgarian issue, Albania, Vilnius, Colombia–Peru, and Mosul. In most of these cases collective security was effective. Candidates could also mention the structural weaknesses of the League which undermined collective security and threatened peace – the USA, Germany and the Soviet Union were not members at the time of the Corfu incident or before 1925. Mention could also be made of the lack of an army and the need for a unanimous vote. Ensure that candidates only receive credit for examples which lie between 1920–25

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.
