



MARKSCHEME

May 2009

**HISTORY – SOUTH ASIA AND
THE MIDDLE EAST
(INCLUDING NORTH AFRICA)**

Higher Level

Paper 3

*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.*

1. “The East India Company was the key factor in the extension of British influence in India up to 1800.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

A number of factors should be identified which could include the collapse of the Moghul Empire, rivalry between the Rajputs, Maharattas and Sikhs, *etc.* French defeats at Madras and Pondicherry led to the end of the French presence therefore limiting rivalry from other powers. Vigorous leadership of Clive and Hastings also a factor, with their support for the EIC.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for a narrative of events and a mention of some factors not all. May lack detail.

[11 to 13 marks] for more detailed answers with a wider range of factors and some analysis.

[14 to 16 marks] as above but with balanced comments on both internal weaknesses.

[17+ marks] reserve this markband for analysis which attempts to reach a judgment in terms of importance.

2. Analyse the factors which contributed to the decline of the Ottoman Empire between 1750 and 1800.

Both external and internal factors should be considered including the weakness of Ottoman control, many areas virtually autonomous *e.g.* Egypt, Mesopotamia and Tunisia. Territory had been lost to both Russia and Austria. Disadvantageous treaties, for example Kutchuk-Kainardji (1774). Napoleon’s expedition to Egypt caused instability. Internal factors could also include administrative weakness and poor finances.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative, descriptive accounts which describe the decline with little or no assessment of possible causes.

[11 to 13 marks] better focus on the question, although may consider either external/internal as more significance.

[14 to 16 marks] better balance in terms of external/internal factors, analysis more developed. May not address all aspects.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical balanced answers which may make a final judgment on which factors were most important.

3. How successful were the policies of Governor Generals in India between 1800 and 1857?

Aims should be identified and judgment made as to how far these were achieved. Reform policies could include education, effective government and removal of ineffective princes (Nawab of Oudh) both extending the influence of Western ideas and attempting to ban what they saw as outmoded religious practices – suttee and thuggee.

Candidates may identify aims when judging success.

Dalhousie more active in extending British rule – Doctrine of Lapse and problems about overseas service *etc.* all eventually led to 1857 – so in one sense policies were not successful if they all contributed to a reaction against British rule, however better answers hopefully will consider the scale of the events of 1857 and weigh this up when considering the level of success.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

4. Assess the impact of Muhammed Ali on Egypt in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The answers should focus on Egypt although many will no doubt consider the process by which Muhammed Ali rose to power. Impact will probably also consider the proposition that Muhammed Ali modernised Egypt and began the process which led to a sense of Egyptian identity and the establishment of the hereditary Pashalik.

Areas that might be mentioned include military reforms to strengthen the regime (1820 New Order); establishing a central government structure (finance and industry ministries, educational and land reform (both benefited the elite)); improved land cultivation and introduction of the cotton industry which would in turn strengthen the economy.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question. There should be some real consideration of the extent of “impact” at this level.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

5. Analyse the reasons for, and the consequences of, European involvement in Ottoman affairs between 1830 and 1878.

Reasons could include Great Britain's interest in maintenance of the status quo; Russia's desire to extend influence in the region / desire for a warm water port; Austria's interest in influence and possibly territory in the Balkans; and France being keen to protect her territories in North Africa.

Other interests could include economic/trade.

Consequences could include assistance to Greece in her struggle for independence, involvement in the Muhammed Ali affairs, the Crimean war, the Eastern Crisis (1875–1878), Congress of Berlin leading to a reduced Turkey, Austria gaining control of Bosnia/Herzegovina, Russian client states such as Bulgaria.

Do not expect all of the above in full detail as very complex but there should be a clear awareness of reasons and consequences.

N.B. Maximum of *[12 marks]* if full discussion of one factor only.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

6. Assess the successes and failures of Abdul Kadir as an Algerian nationalist.

Abdul Kadir emerged in the early 1830s as a nationalist leader hostile to Turks – colluded with French: Treaty of Tafna 1837, acknowledged his Emirate of two thirds of Algeria. French influence extended by 1840; conflict renewed. Abdul Kadir had developed larger army but tended to fight other Muslim Brotherhoods and favoured religious aristocracy rather than military leaders. He was poorly organized and received some criticism of his initial truce with France. French had effective leadership (Bugeaud) plenty of resources (80 000 – 100 000 troops), ruthless tactics, destroyed Arab crops *etc.* Arab nationalists defeated at Battle of River Islay and bombardment of Tangier. Abdul Kadir outlawed but some renewal of insurrection 1845–1847. No resources and Abdul Kadir surrender, French victorious.

N.B. Maximum of *[12 marks]* if only one factor discussed.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] narrative of the extension of French control 1830–1847. Reference to Abdul Kadir will probably be limited to his role as Arab leader.

[11 to 13 marks] as above but more reference to Abdul Kadir and some attempt to account for failure.

[14 to 16 marks] analysis more developed although may be unbalanced, focusing on either French strength or weakness of Abdul Kadir.

[17+ marks] balanced argument which considers a number of factors contributing to failure. May take the longer view that although defeated Abdul Kadir had raised the profile of Algerian identity with long-term consequences.

7. “The Lebanese Settlement of 1861 effectively reduced the tensions which had led to Civil War in 1860.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Answers will need to clearly identify the tensions which led to Civil War. These could include Communal tensions (between Christians and Muslims but also within each religious group), economic tensions between landlord and peasants, the weakness of Ottoman rule, and therefore its inability to impose stable government in the area. Additionally, the intervention of both Britain and France contributed to the outbreak of the conflict.

Good answers will have to consider how successfully the establishment of the Montassarifah resolved these tensions, limited role for Government, Communal power-sharing, continued British support for Druze and Maronites. If there is no consideration of the settlement then only **[12 marks]** can be gained.

[0 to 7 marks] limited generalized accounts of events of 1860.

[8 to 10 marks] more detailed accounts of events, causes of tensions clearly identified. Limited account of the settlement.

[11 to 13 marks] more balanced answers which deal in detail with tensions and the settlement. Analysis of resolution limited.

[14 to 16 marks] fully analytical answers supported by detailed knowledge of causes and clear analysis of settlement.

[17+ marks] as above but may consider that the settlement did provide relative stability up to 1914. May also comment that Communal divisions still an issue in Lebanon.

8. Compare and contrast the reasons for the emergence of the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League between 1858 and 1919.

Arguments may vary and may refer back to underlying tensions prior to 1857. However the main focus ought to consider both the INC and the Muslim League. Factors considered may include restrictions on entry to the ICS. Limited participation in government, resentment at economic exploitation, differential treatment of Indians and British *e.g.* Vernacular Press Act, the repeal of the Ilbert Bill, partition of Bengal, Morley-Minto Reforms, increasing political awareness amongst educated Indians and their awareness of the contradictory nature of British government. Some answers may also discuss limited membership of both organizations prior to the First World War.

Focus on “reasons” is important for higher level marks.

N.B. Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one factor is discussed.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments. Describing emergence of nationalist organizations – probably chronological.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Arguments with limited examples and analysis. More emphasis on the full range of factors.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers; some may not address all aspects of the question. Answers may begin to consider misgovernment.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question. Answers are likely to consider the role played by misgovernment and/or the development of an Indian national consciousness.

9. “Abdul Hamid II was described as an enlightened despot.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Forced to grant a constitution in 1876 to enlist British support against Russia, Abdul Hamid II suspended it in 1878 and ruled autocratically. However he was a moderniser and introduced extensive educational reforms leading to a new educated Turkish elite. Military training also improved and there were some improvements in communications. All of these were limited and the repressive nature of his regime, territorial losses and anxiety over Macedonia led to the emergence of the Young Turk movement which desired a return to the 1876 constitution. After the Revolution occurred in 1908, Abdul Hamid II was forced to allow a parliament, but his attempts to renege on reform led to his deposition in 1909, so certainly not willing to allow political reform *i.e.* fairly despotic.

[0 to 7 marks] for general narrative accounts of the reign of Abdul Hamid II.

[8 to 10 marks] for more detailed knowledge but still largely narrative.

[11 to 13 marks] for detailed knowledge though analysis is likely to be limited to assertions about despotic nature of regime.

[14 to 16 marks] for analysis which considers the impact of some of his modernising policies and consequences of their limited extent. Answers here may consider the issue of how enlightened he was.

[17+ marks] for fully developed analysis which examines frustrations resulting from modernisation, but not Westernisation, in political terms.

10. Assess the social and economic developments in Iran in the late nineteenth century.

The key to economic development in the nineteenth century was effective communication systems. Iran had little in the way of effective port, road or railway systems, thus economic activity was geared to local markets and subsistence, except where there was access to the communications systems of other countries (*e.g.* Caspian Sea or Trans-Caspian railway). Some high value foreign trade developed during the nineteenth century (hand-woven carpets *etc.*) and a merchant class did develop but was very much limited to urban centres. Lack of financial systems also hampered economic development (no bank until 1888 and an elementary credit system). There was little government investment and limited foreign investment. Social developments were also limited – there was no consistent Government policy for education; although specialist military colleges and language schools were opened, they were limited to the elite. The geography of the country plus substantial tribal populations and the absence of foreign minorities as drivers of change meant that Iran did not experience pressures for change seen in Ottoman Turkey or Egypt.

[0 to 7 marks] general unsubstantiated comments on traditional nature of Iranian society.

[8 to 10 marks] narrative accounts which deal with both social and economic issues but lack detail.

[11 to 13 marks] more detailed analysis of both social and economic development.

[14 to 16 marks] clear focus on a range of factors which hindered change.

[17+ marks] as above but may also wish to consider the nature of government as a major factor limiting social and economic development/or possibly the argument that Shia Muslims more “other-worldly” and less inclined to organize society for material development. The focus is the defeat of Turkey not diplomacy during war.

11. How important was the Arab Revolt of 1916 in the eventual defeat of Turkey in the First World War?

Strategic importance – broke the Medina-Damascus Railway link, diverted Turkish resources from Palestine until Allenby’s arrival. Reduced Ottoman threat to Egypt. Subsequently, British able to capture Jerusalem and Damascus and the Turks surrendered, but Turks would probably have surrendered once central powers were defeated in Europe.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative account with accurate knowledge and fairly basic judgment on importance.

[11 to 13 marks] accurate accounts with consistent comment on importance, setting the Arab revolt in the context of the war in the Middle East.

[14 to 16 marks] accurate detailed knowledge, developed comment on importance particularly related to Turkish surrender.

[17+ marks] as above but also considering the issues of Ottoman Empire’s inability to continue the war in the long term.

12. Assess the impact of Reza Shah on Iran between 1926 and 1941.

Reza Shah had established the Pahlavi dynasty by 1926. His aim then was to centralise and modernise Iran along western European models. A centralised bureaucratic state was established, the law courts were secularised at the expense of religious law, laws were passed to symbolise Iran's evolution into a modern state (banning the veil, ethnic dress, polygamy and discouraging divorce).

Economic development concentrating on industry and communications, but no land reform. Financial developments had adverse effects on poorer sections of the population. Iran unable to reduce control of Anglo-Iranian Oil Company until 1933.

Consequences: benefits to some sections of the population who flourished in military and civil service. Rural poor and religious elements disliked Westernisation. Reform achieved because of the essentially dictatorial nature of regime, which was deposed when Allies invaded in 1941. Impact could be considered to be limited.

[0 to 7 marks] general accounts of the establishment of regime. No focus on policies.

[8 to 10 marks] accounts of the reform programme. Some understanding of the reasons behind reforms.

[11 to 13 marks] more detailed knowledge of reforms, clear understanding of aims, limited comment on consequences.

[14 to 16 marks] clear understanding of both aims and consequences, clearly highlighting the variable impact on Iran.

[17+ marks] as above but also with informed comment on the fact that reforms were to some extent imposed from above and did not have major impact for most Iranians.

13. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the Gulf states in the 1920s and 1930s.

Answers should be supported with specific reference to a number of states/areas to enable a full analysis of the strengths and weaknesses. Factors to be considered could include the economy, levels of autonomy, social and political stability.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

14. Analyse the causes and nature of the Algerian War of Liberation (1954–1962).

Causes: candidates might consider economic disparity between Arabs and settlers, legacy of post-war violence *e.g.* Setif Riots. An unwillingness by settlers to consider further concessions led to the emergence of a militant nationalist movement (FLN) led by Ben Bella.

Factors leading to a lengthy ferocious war: French army determined not to lose Algeria as they had Vietnam, tactics of FLN and the fierce military response made compromise increasingly difficult. Deployment of large numbers of French troops (500 000) increased the potential for violence and nationalist resentment of what was seen as an army of occupation. Government in Paris unable to define a clear policy until De Gaulle negotiated the Evian Agreement 1962.

N.B. Maximum of *[12 marks]* if only one factor discussed.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] narrative of events, reasonable detail but no focus on either “ferocious” or “lengthy”.

[11 to 13 marks] as above but some attempt to comment on the nature of the war – may be unbalanced.

[14 to 16 marks] considers both nature and duration of the war linking these to the difficulties of compromise *etc.*

[17+ marks] full analysis of a wide range of factors possibly setting the Algerian conflict in the context of North Africa as a whole, *e.g.* Algerian resentment that Tunisia and Morocco were both independent, also may consider the fact that settlers had a great deal more to lose in Algeria in economic terms because they owned one third of all fertile land.

15. How valid is the view that Britain withdrew from the Palestine Mandate as a consequence of long-term tensions and short-term weaknesses?

No doubt the details of tensions in the 1920s and 1930s will be well known, analysis should consider the difficulties this presented to Britain as the administrative power. Short-term weakness should include Britain's post-Second World War position: economic weakness but also difficulties elsewhere such as India which made it more difficult for Britain to deal with the unrest in Palestine after 1945. Other aspects could include British reliance on US and US support for Jews in the post-war period.

Answers are likely to concentrate on long-term tensions – reserve higher mark bands for balanced answers.

N.B. Maximum of *[12 marks]* if only one factor discussed.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

16. “Gandhi’s contribution to Indian independence was both positive and negative.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Positive aspects will probably include his role in the extension of popular support for congress and the notion of independence. Details of his campaigns will be well known but should be linked with comment on their impact on Britain’s response / changing attitudes.

Negative aspects could include the whole issue of a united India and the fact that Gandhi was committed to this concept added to the difficulties in the post-war period of reaching an agreement with the British, a delay which resulted in increased tensions/potential for violence. The Hindu nature of the Gandhi led Congress also contributed to Muslim fears resulting in the idea of partition.

The bulk of answers will probably consider the positive aspects, reserve higher mark bands for answers which have objective analysis of the negative aspects.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

17. Compare and contrast the domestic and foreign policies of Nasser and Mubarak.

Comparisons: In politics both powerful dominant presidents in a one-party state although there has been some relaxation under Mubarak and an element of party activity has been allowed. Although still repression of Muslim Brotherhood – still basically an authoritarian state.

Contrasts: Economic policies – Nasser pursued Land reform and nationalisation of some industries, seemed to be an element of socialism. Mubarak very much more capitalist and favours privatisation and less protection for workers. Foreign Policy – Nasser was non-aligned and after Aswan Dam issue and Suez Crisis on poor terms with Western powers. Very keen on Pan Arabism (UAR), hostile to Israel (Six Day War). Mubarak: more moderate on Israel, rejoined Arab League in 1989. Cooperated with coalition forces in Gulf War 1991 and as a consequence US and European powers cancelled millions of dollars of Egyptian debt.

N.B. Maximum *[7 marks]* if only one factor discussed.

Answers will probably focus more on contrasts but to reach higher mark bands both aspects should be covered.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

18. How successful were the modernising policies of Nehru in India between 1947 and 1969?

Policies to consider: unifying India into a nation state (largely achieved by 1952), social policies – trying to tackle caste issues with Untouchability (“Offences”) Act, changes to marriage laws, education extension *etc.*, modernising could also include the economy in terms of strengthening it using the five year plans.

Details will be well known and the higher mark bands should be reserved for essays which really consider success in achieving aims.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

19. Analyse the reasons for the political dominance of the military in Pakistan from 1947 to the mid 1980s.

Key reasons could include the limited development of a democratic political system, weak civilian politicians after the early deaths of Jinnah and Liaquat Ali Khan. Problems caused by the economic and geographical division of the country exacerbated political tensions and led to the growth of Bengali nationalism. Ongoing tensions with India over Kashmir also contributed to the high profile of the military in Pakistani affairs.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments. Answers will probably consist of a narrative of the various times the military took over without really identifying reasons.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

20. Assess the long-term and short-term causes of the 1979 Iranian Revolution.

Long-term causes could include going back as far as the restoration of the Shah by the US, the White Revolution and its impact. The nature of the Shah's regime – limited political development, repression by SAVAK and the growth of opposition. As a consequence much of it focused around the Ulema.

Short-term causes will include the influence of Khomeini on opposition groups and the attempts to reduce it by the Shah, increasing economic problems, what was perceived to be increasing US influence and the belated attempts by the Shah to introduce a measure of reform.

There should be a balance of long and short-term causes if only one, or the other, then even very detailed answers should not gain more than **[12 marks]**.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

21. How effectively was Lebanon stabilized politically and economically between 1989 and 1995?

1989 marks the Taif Agreement which appeared to be aimed at ending the confessional system that had caused so many political problems not popular with all groups and General Aoun attempted to dominate politics against a background of considerable violence and militia activity. In 1991 the new constitution began to operate but elections reflected the confessional loyalties of the previous system. Still problems in the South, tensions between Israel, and the PLO were still a destabilising factor. The Kuwait crisis gave Syria the opportunity to intervene and deal with the violence and crush the militias especially in Beirut. Political stability was therefore largely because of Syrian influence.

Economic stability: Inflation massive in 1992 but relative political stability led to increased business confidence and a return of many of the business class who had fled. Foreign aid was also a factor in economic recovery as reconstruction generated economic activity. By 1994 the economy was growing at 4 % per annum but recovery tended to be in the North and around Beirut.

Both aspects should be considered for the higher mark bands.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

22. Why were there so many armed conflicts between Israel and her neighbours between 1948 and 1973?

The actual events of the conflicts, 1948–1949, the Suez Crisis 1956, the Six Day War 1967 and the Yom Kippur War 1973 will no doubt be well known and the immediate reasons should also be discussed. However there should also be some analysis of “why”, which could include the whole issue of failed solutions, the Palestinian refugee problem and the emergence of the PLO, Israel’s search for security, problems over the occupied territories post 1967, the refusal of Arab states to recognise the Israeli state were all contextual reasons for ongoing tensions which resulted in conflict.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

23. Analyse the reasons for the changing policies of the superpowers in the Middle East in the years between 1950 and 1990.

In the earlier part of the period both sought allies in the region for strategic “Cold War” reasons *e.g.* USSR was worried about her Southern defences after the Baghdad pact was signed. US worried about oil supplies and also for domestic political reasons the survival of Israel. In the 1970s both were more concerned with stability in the region and the US particularly was actively trying to further the peace process (Camp David) and was also worried about the effect of events in Iran in 1979. The USSR engagement in Afghanistan meant she was less interested in gaining client states in the region. From the mid-1980s, with lessening Cold War tensions, the Middle East became an area where both powers were concerned to try and lessen the potential for conflict.

A broad question but one where candidates should be able to identify that policy was mostly dictated by the needs of the superpowers: either security or economic priorities.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

24. To what extent did domestic issues contribute to Saddam Hussein’s decision to invade Kuwait in 1990?

Domestic reasons could include: economic weakness the huge cost of the Iran-Iraq war meant that living standards were stagnating and could possibly have contributed to the growth of an opposition movement despite having won the war. There was also a problem that the majority of military personnel were Shia who were a potential threat to the minority Sunni government.

Other factors: dispute over the Shatt-el-Arab waterway. Disputes with OPEC over oil prices, a desire to challenge US influence in the other Arab states.

Higher level mark bands should be reserved for answers which fully consider the issue of “extent” and this could include discussion as to how secure Saddam’s regime was domestically, allowing some consideration of the fact that the regime survived defeat in Kuwait for many years.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.

25. Analyse the impact of tensions between secularisation and religious traditions in any *one* state in the region.

Answers should have specific detail and exemplars can also include India and Pakistan as well as the more usual states. Impact could consider: politics, social and cultural issues, education, gender issues.

[0 to 7 marks] for unsubstantiated generalisations, inadequate general answers or vague, inaccurate and irrelevant comments.

[8 to 10 marks] for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or undeveloped arguments.

[11 to 13 marks] for narrative framework with explicit focus on the question. Relevant arguments are present but may be unbalanced/underdeveloped.

[14 to 16 marks] for analytical, well-focused, relevant, developed and balanced answers: some may not address all aspects of the question.

[17+ marks] for fully analytical and relevant answers with detail, insight, perceptive comments and perhaps different interpretations, which address all aspects of the question.
