



88115330



International Baccalaureate®  
Baccalauréat International  
Bachillerato Internacional

**HISTORY**

**ROUTE 2**

**HIGHER LEVEL AND STANDARD LEVEL**

**PAPER 1 – PEACEMAKING, PEACEKEEPING – INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS 1918–36**

Thursday 10 November 2011 (afternoon)

1 hour

---

**INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES**

- Do not open this examination paper until instructed to do so.
- Answer all the questions.

*Read all the sources carefully and answer all the questions that follow.*

*Sources in this paper have been edited: word additions or explanations are shown in square brackets [ ]; substantive deletions of text are indicated by ellipses ... ; minor changes are not indicated.*

*These sources and questions relate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932–1934).*

**SOURCE A**                      *Extract from **The League of Nations** by George Gill, 1996. George Gill was a professor of History at Fordham University, New York.*

Mussolini was convinced that the key to political and economic stability was the “collaboration of the four great Western Powers” and therefore proposed a four power pact in which France, Germany, Great Britain and Italy would support treaty revision and pledge equality to Germany if the [Geneva] Disarmament Conference failed to do so. The French found the equality clause objectionable and removed it from the final draft of the pact, but the plan also antagonized the smaller nations attending the [Geneva] Disarmament Conference as another humiliating example of major power negotiations that ignored them. League officials realized that Mussolini’s insistence on leadership by the stronger nations threatened the constitutional principles under which the Assembly and Council functioned.

**SOURCE B**                      *Extract from a memorandum by Brigadier Temperley to the British Cabinet, 16 May 1933. Brigadier Temperley was the military advisor to the British delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Conference.*

If it is dangerous to go forward with this disarmament, what is then to be done? There appears to be one bold solution. France, the United States and Britain should address a stern warning to Germany that there can be no disarmament, no equality of status and no relaxation of the Treaty of Versailles unless a complete reversion of present military preparations and tendencies takes place in Germany. Admittedly this would provoke a crisis and the danger of war will be brought appreciably nearer. Britain would have to say that it insists upon the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles, and in this insistence, with its hint of force in the background, presumably the United States would not join. But Germany knows that she cannot fight at present and we must call her bluff. She is powerless in the face of the French army and our fleet.

**SOURCE C**                      *Extract from **The Origins of the Second World War in Europe** by PMH Bell, 1993. PMH Bell was a lecturer in History at the University of Liverpool, UK, specializing in European History.*

In 1932 the British government agreed in principle to abandon the assumption that no major war was expected for ten years, but it also decided that while the Disarmament Conference was in session no action would be taken to rearm. It was politically impossible to begin rearmament during the conference. Instead, the British laboured tirelessly to find the basis for an agreement on arms limitation, which meant changing the positions of France and Germany, by bringing French armaments down and allowing German armaments to rise ... The British later proposed an increase in the German army from 100 000 to 200 000, while the French army would be reduced, and then agreed that Germany should have an air force half the size of the French. The French government too, under pressure from domestic opinion and reluctant to isolate itself from Britain, made considerable concessions during the conference. Public respectability was thus given to German rearmament, which was already secretly under way, as the British government knew.

**SOURCE D**

*Extract from the Report of the Special Committee on Investigation of the Munitions Industry (The Nye Report), US Congress, Senate, 74<sup>th</sup> Congress, 2<sup>nd</sup> session, 24 February 1936.*

In 1932, another disarmament conference was held at Geneva. By this time the failure to prevent the rearmament of Germany had resulted in great profits to the French steel industry, which had received large orders for the building of the continuous line of fortifications across the north of France, to the French munitions companies, and profits were beginning to flow into the American and English pockets from German orders for aviation supplies. This in turn resulted in a French and English aviation race. With Germany openly rearming, the much-heralded disarmament conference, which convened in 1932, has failed completely. It was pointed out by a committee member that some representatives were aware that “the effect of the failure to check the [Versailles] Treaty violation even goes to the extent of making a subsequent disarmament convention, if not improbable in its success, at least calculated to produce only an unworkable document”.

**SOURCE E**

*A cartoon by David Low, published in the London Evening Standard, 2 October 1933.*



Simon Mussolini Daladier

Hitler

“WELL – WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO ABOUT IT NOW?”

[Source: London Evening Standard]

1. (a) Why, according to Source A, was there opposition to Mussolini's plan for a four power pact? *[3 marks]*  
(b) What is the message conveyed by Source E? *[2 marks]*
  2. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and C about the Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932–1934). *[6 marks]*
  3. With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source B and Source D for historians studying the Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932–1934). *[6 marks]*
  4. Using the sources and your own knowledge, explain why the Geneva Disarmament Conference (1932–1934) failed to achieve its aims. *[8 marks]*
-