



MARKSCHEME

May 2011

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 IB Cardiff.*

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 significance of the 1930 London Naval Conference? **[3 marks]**

- It was the apex of the naval arms race control process;
- Parity (equality) between America and Britain was agreed to for every type of warship;
- Japan had accepted a smaller ratio for every category except submarines;
- Although it did not last, it marked a considerable success in the disarmament process;
- When the French and the Italians did not sign the treaty Britain inserted a clause that would allow it to withdraw.

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 cartoon shows the lack of enthusiasm of Italy and France for the Conference. It also shows the hostility between them, as their leaders are pictured looking at one another suspiciously across a table;
- It shows good relations between Great Britain and the US who are portrayed arm in arm and demonstrating enthusiasm about the prospects of disarmament;
- The fact that Britain and the US are standing could also be interpreted as an indication of them taking a lead in disarmament conferences.

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

Do not enter half marks or + and – but compensate between (a) and (b) if necessary for a final mark out of [5 marks].

2. **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources D and E about the London Naval Conference.** *[6 marks]*

For “compare”

- They both make criticisms of the London Naval Agreement of 1930;
- Both recognise strains in the relations between France and Italy;
- Both consider the Treaty to have limited duration.

For “contrast”

- Source E is more critical of the agreement than Source D;
- Source D addresses some of the reasons why the agreement was made possible; Source E only focuses on effects;
- Source E focuses on how the agreement could affect Britain in a negative way; Source D offers a more general perspective of the effects;
- Source E mentions tension between the US and Japan; Source D makes no reference to this.

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.

- 3. With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source A and Source B for historians studying the 1930 London Naval Conference. [6 marks]**

Source A

Origin: Statement by US president Herbert Hoover at a press conference on 22 July 1930.

Purpose: To inform that the US government is signing the treaty on that day. To explain why the US government is supporting the treaty.

Value: It's an official communication recorded at the time the treaty was made and shows the views of the president of the United States on the significance of the Naval Treaty. This speech offers the rationale of the US government's public position at this point in time.

Limitations: As a statement to the press, the speech could be serving the purpose of justifying US foreign policy before opposition to the government and before public opinion.

Source B

Origin: Extract from a book written by Phillips Payson O' Brien an academic in the UK published 1998.

Purpose: To analyse the naval policies of Britain and the US between 1900 and 1936.

Value: The academic background of the author. The fact that the book was published many years after the conference enabled the author to look at events with hindsight and produce an assessment of the Naval Conference.

Limitations: The title of the book suggests that the focus is only on US and British naval policies, so the information about France, Italy and Japan may not be fully developed.

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 extent to which you agree with the view that the London Naval Conference was unsuccessful.** [8 marks]

Source material

- Source A: The source believes that the conference was a success as it produced a treaty that would improve international relations by limiting armaments.
- Source B: The source acknowledges achievements in the negotiations (parity between America and Britain; Japanese acceptance of a smaller ratio). However, it also states that “No ships were scrapped and naval construction increased markedly after the conference”. It mentions that the British would need more cruisers after 1935 and had included a clause allowing them to withdraw, which indicates uncertainty about the Conference’s success.
- Source C: The source shows that even before the conference had taken place, there was suspicion and lack of enthusiasm among participants. It portrays the tense relations between France and Italy over naval disarmament. Only Britain and the US seem to have reasons to celebrate the conference.
- Source D: The source refers to the rivalry between France and Italy and how it affected negotiations over naval disarmament. It also mentions the fact that the Treaty could not be extended nor maintained and was a product of very particular circumstances rather than political will to achieve disarmament.
- Source E: The source is very critical of the conference. It considers that it had a negative impact on British naval defence, and that it damaged relations between France and Italy as well as those between the US and Japan. It mentions that the conference’s terms had a limited duration and that negotiations would be more difficult in 1935. It believes Britain would be in a weaker position to negotiate at that time.

Own knowledge

Relative successes: Some level of agreement was reached, such as a 10:10:7 ratio between the US, Britain and Japan; an agreement not to build capital ship replacements between 1931 and 1936 was reached; negotiations in areas such as the size and numbers of vessels each nation was allowed to have shown some success; the treaty also set some restrictions on submarine warfare; also the funds which were saved by the governments could be used to contribute to other areas of their economies affected by the Great Depression.

Failures: The impact of the treaty on Japanese politics contributed to increased nationalism and militarism which eventually led to the withdrawal of Japan from the naval disarmament system; the failure of further negotiations between Italy and France; the treaty allowed escalation of weapons if there was an act of aggression by a non-signatory country; and further details on the negative impact of the treaty on the British Navy. The Anglo–German Naval Agreement (1935) also indicates the limited success of the treaty.

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 marks]. For maximum [8 marks] expect argument, synthesis of source material and own knowledge, as well as references to the sources used.
