



# **MARKSCHEME**

**MAY 2010**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level**

**Paper 3 – Aspects of the history of  
Europe and the Middle East**

*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.*

*Paper 3 markbands: The following bands provide a précis of the full markbands for paper 3 published in the History guide (2008) on pages 77–81. They are intended to assist marking, but must be used in conjunction with the full markbands found in the guide. For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate’s work please contact your team leader.*

<b>0:</b>	Answers not meeting the requirements of descriptors should be awarded no marks.
<b>1–2:</b>	Answers do not meet the demands of the question and show little or no evidence of appropriate structure. There is little more than unsupported generalization.
<b>3–4:</b>	There is little understanding of the question. Historical knowledge is present but the detail is insufficient. Historical context or processes are barely understood and there are little more than poorly substantiated assertions.
<b>5–6:</b>	Answers indicate some understanding of the question, but historical knowledge is limited in quality and quantity. Understanding of historical processes may be present but underdeveloped. The question is only partially addressed.
<b>7–8:</b>	The demands of the question are generally understood. Relevant, in-depth, historical knowledge is present but is unevenly applied. Knowledge is narrative or descriptive in nature. There may be limited argument that requires further substantiation. Critical commentary may be present. An attempt to place events in historical context and show an understanding of historical processes. An attempt at a structured approach, either chronological or thematic has been made.
<b>9–11:</b>	Answers indicate that the question is understood, but not all implications considered. Knowledge is largely accurate. Critical commentary may be present. Events are generally placed in context, and historical processes, such as comparison and contrast, are understood. There is a clear attempt at a structured approach. Focus on AO1, AO2 and AO4. Responses that simply summarize the views of historians cannot reach the top of this markband.
<b>12–14:</b>	Answers are clearly focused on the demands of the question. Relevant in-depth knowledge is applied as evidence, and analysis or critical commentary is used to indicate some in-depth understanding, but is not consistent throughout. Events are placed in context and there is sound understanding of historical processes and comparison and contrast. Evaluation of different approaches may be used to substantiate arguments presented. Synthesis is present, but not always consistently integrated. Focus on AO3 and AO4.
<b>15–17:</b>	Answers are clearly structured and focused, have full awareness of the demands of the question, and if appropriate may challenge it. Accurate and detailed historical knowledge is used convincingly to support critical commentary. Historical processes such as comparison and contrast, placing events in context and evaluating different interpretations are used appropriately and effectively. Answers are well-structured and balanced and synthesis is well-developed and supported with knowledge and critical commentary.
<b>18–20:</b>	Answers are clearly focused with a high degree of the awareness of the question and may challenge it successfully. Knowledge is extensive, accurately applied and there may be a high level of conceptual ability. Evaluation of different approaches may be present as may be understanding of historical processes as well as comparison and contrast where relevant. Evaluation is integrated into the answer. The answer is well-structured and well-focused. Synthesis is highly developed.

**1. To what extent was Louis XVI responsible for the outbreak of revolution in France in 1789?**

Louis XVI was king of France from 1774. He was deposed in 1792 and executed in 1793. Candidates must consider how far he was responsible for the outbreak of revolution in 1789. Some points to analyse for his responsibility are: his personality was unsuitable for ruling, he was awkward, indecisive, lacking in self-confidence, but regarded his kingship as a duty from God; he had little knowledge of the state of France, as he rarely moved out of the Paris–Versailles area; he did not understand finance, and failed to realize that the cost of taking part in the War of American Independence, and failure to change the outdated tax system bankrupted the monarchy; he failed to support reforms suggested by his ministers including Turgot, Necker, Calonne and Brienne; he, and especially his wife, were considered to be extravagant; his part in calling the Estates General acted as a trigger for the outbreak of revolution

Candidates could also briefly consider other causes in order to satisfy “to what extent”, such as the philosophers, poor economic situation with bad harvests, *etc.*, the opposition of the nobility to change from a system from which they profited, but this question should not be changed into a “general causes of the French Revolution” question. The main focus should be on the responsibility of Louis XVI.

**2. “Napoleon will trample underfoot [destroy] the rights of man, put himself above them and become a tyrant.” To what extent was this prediction correct?**

This question requires candidates to consider the reign of Napoleon I, and to analyse his actions and policies to decide if he was a tyrant. Mentioning the rights of man, suggests that the French Revolution gave “rights” to the French people, candidates could also compare Napoleon’s rule with the revolutionary era, and give judgement on which was more tyrannical. Thus there are two possible ways to answer this question.

Briefly, the French Revolution was positive and beneficial in that it ended the old feudal system and outdated monarchy and gave rights to all citizens. It also harmed France with much bloodshed and lack of good government which failed to maintain law and order.

Napoleon became First Consul in 1799 and Emperor in 1804. He too had positive and negative effects. Many of his reforms, such as bringing the provinces under central control, preserving many of the gains of the revolution in the Code Napoleon and making a concordat with the Pope, were carried out before 1804.

Answers should consider the nature of the Napoleonic state, what rights the French people had and the extent that the Napoleonic code protected them. Napoleon used Fouché and his police to monitor and control potential opposition.

**3. Analyse the political factors involved in the unification of Italy up to 1861.**

Political factors could include some of the following: republicanism; the monarchy; constitutional rights, or the lack of them; the division of Italy into separate states; foreign involvement; and the part played by the Papacy. Candidates will probably not address all of these, and weaker candidates will narrate Italian unification with only implicit attention to political factors. A thematic approach or structure would probably be most appropriate.

Points to consider could include: monarchical rule was considered tyrannical, especially in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies under Ferdinand II, but Piedmont/Sardinia was granted a constitution, and regarded as a constitutional monarchy. Republicanism was preached by Mazzini in his Young Italy movement and in his revolutionary actions, such as the setting up of the Roman Republic in 1848. Garibaldi was originally a republican follower of Mazzini, but changed in 1861 to support a united Italian kingdom under Victor Emmanuel II; the internal politics of Piedmont, with Cavour as prime minister could also be considered, including Cavour's aims. Was it to strengthen Piedmont or to unify Italy? The role of European powers in Italian unification could be assessed, especially those of Austria, Britain and France. Candidates may argue that the wealth and strength of Piedmont was more important than political factors/ideas.

*There is thus much material that candidates should have studied, but do not expect or demand all of the above. Focused analysis is necessary for a "good" mark.*

**4. Discuss the relative importance of the decline of Austria and the policies of Bismarck as causes of German unification.**

This question is focused on the weakness of Austria and Bismarck's policies. The wording of the question should lead candidates to structure their answers to address these two areas. They should also judge their relative importance. Candidates should back their choice with specific analysis and a clear argument.

Austria was overstretched by the Congress of Vienna and excluded from the Zollverein and suffered from nationalist tensions within the Empire. There was also a lack of raw materials for industrial advancements, a refusal to modernize, economically or politically and a generally backward looking outlook. A brief comment on the contrast with Prussia's strengths could be made relevant.

The question is not intended to provoke narratives of Bismarck's three wars, but to be an analysis of how his policies led to German unification. His attention to the economy, diplomacy, and the army should be examined, followed by an explanation of the importance of the wars in bringing about German unification. Some answers may focus on Bismarck's opportunism and question whether unification was his aim.

*The conclusion on "relative importance" should be consistent with specific evidence in the two sections. If only one section is addressed mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**5. Why was the Ottoman Empire regarded as an empire in decline in the nineteenth century?**

The focus of the question is “why” the empire was in decline. Factors to be considered could include internal problems such as nationalist agitation within the empire, which led to Greek independence in 1831, loss of territory such as Egypt and constant unrest in areas such as Bulgaria. Other problems include: difficulty in implementing reforms because of the resistance of traditional elements; financial weakness; weak sultans. Internationally the frequent intervention of the other major powers highlighted the weakness of the empire (Crimea, Russo/Turkish War, Congress of Berlin, *etc.*) and contributed to continuing decline.

**6. Analyse the causes and results of civil war in Lebanon in 1860.**

In the mid-eighteenth century Lebanon was part of the Ottoman Empire. The main factions in the country were the Druze (whose religion was of Islamist origin) and the Maronite Christians. Because of conflict between the two, Mount Lebanon was divided into Maronite and Druze districts. This increased tension by making power bases for the opposing factions. Maronites also rebelled against the Ottoman Empire, and in 1858 the old feudal system of taxes and levies ended. In 1860 a full scale civil war broke out. The Maronites openly opposed the Ottomans, so the Druzes took advantage and burned Maronite villages. The Turks tried to restore peace and order, and Napoleon III sent in 7 000 French troops.

Results could include: large numbers of Maronite casualties (4 000 killed and a similar number died of destitution, plus 100 000 were made homeless); continued communal tension and violence; the forcing of Maronites into an enclave cut off from Beirut; Christian resentment and poverty.

On the other hand, candidates could argue that the Confessional structure which was established led to relative stability for the next half century.

**7. Examine the nature and development of political parties in Britain between 1867 and 1914.**

By 1914 there were three main political parties in Britain: Conservatives, Liberals and Labour. Candidates need to examine the state of the parties between these dates.

The Conservative Party was originally known as the Tory Party. Disraeli was largely responsible for its nature between 1867 and 1914. Its programme was based on a commitment to traditional institutions, defence of the British Empire and plus some protectionist trade policies. The Conservative Party and the Liberal Party were the two major parties in Britain until the 1920s.

The Liberal Party was originally the Whig Party. It was joined by dissident Tories after Peel split the Tory/Conservative Party. Its main features were free trade, reform and restraint in foreign affairs. Some members left the party and joined the Conservatives in opposition to Gladstone's Irish policies. The liberals were the party of the middle class non-conformists.

The Labour Party only became an "official" party in 1906, when it was formed from the members of the Labour Representation Committee (LRC). In 1874 two trade unionists were elected as Liberal MPs. Keir Hardie initiated a campaign amongst the various socialist organizations, that a political party should be formed. Hardie and two supporters were elected as independent MPs in 1892. The Independent Labour Party was formed in 1893, followed by the LRC in 1900. In 1906 the 26 MP members of the LRC changed its name to the Labour Party.

All of the parties had a class base to some extent.

**8. Why did the Second French Empire, ruled by Napoleon III, collapse in 1870?**

Prince Louis Napoleon was elected president of the Second French Republic and became Emperor in 1852. Some of the points to analyse in order to explain why the Empire collapsed (a plebiscite in 1870 confirmed a new constitution by 7.2 million votes to 1.5 million against) could be: the age and ill health of Napoleon, who was persuaded to enter war against Bismarck and Prussia; defeat in diplomacy and then in the Franco-Prussian War by Bismarck; this defeat led to Napoleon's overthrow and the end of the Second Empire; early ambitious and expensive foreign policies such as Mexico had weakened the French army and national finances; early policies and the change to the "liberal Empire" with the new constitution, might be made relevant.

Some argument could be made for the view that demands for the republic came from Paris, which had always been hostile to the Empire. The plebiscite of 1870 indicated that the Empire and Napoleon had the support of most French people.

**9. “His measures of reform did not disguise his belief in the need to maintain autocratic rule.”  
To what extent do you agree with this view of Alexander II?**

Many candidates will probably agree with the quotation, firstly by saying that Alexander’s motives for reform were to preserve his position and authority as Tsar; that he realized the necessity for reform, especially after Russian failure in the Crimean War; and that reform was better from above than below. A key point for this view is that although the serfs were emancipated and local assemblies instituted, no national assembly, or Duma/parliament, was put in place. Another line of argument could be that emancipation did not satisfy many of the aspirations of the peasants, or improve their economic positions, and that other economic reforms, such as building railways which stimulated growth in coal, iron and other industries, also benefited the monarchy. The army reforms, which were largely successful also supported the maintenance of autocratic rule. Many of the reforms replaced the roles previously filled by the nobility.

The quotation could be challenged by Alexander being called the “Tsar Liberator”, the importance and nature of judicial and educational reforms, as well as an assessment of the enormity of granting freedom and rights to the serfs.

**10. Compare and contrast the causes and nature of the two 1917 Russian Revolutions.**

The factual details of the two Russian Revolutions of 1917, are often confused. The first was in February/March, and the second, often called the Bolshevik Revolution, was in October/November.

Some areas to compare are: both were against the government in power; both were opposed to the current government; both brought great change; the First World War and the hardships it caused was a factor in both; peasants, workers and the Soviets played some part in both. Economic crisis was also a factor in both.

Areas of contrast could include: the first revolution was a spontaneous mass movement which developed out of an almost general strike, whereas the Bolshevik Revolution was more of a coup, planned by the Bolshevik Party; the first was against the Tsar, the second to overthrow the Provisional Government; the Tsar was overthrown in the first, and killed after the second. There was less bloodshed and violence in the second: five soldiers, one sailor and no defenders were killed. The first revolution was unplanned and spontaneous, the second was a coup d’etat.

*If only one of the 1917 Revolutions is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*



**11. Evaluate continuity and change in German foreign policy between 1871 and 1914.**

In 1871 Bismarck as Chancellor was in charge of foreign policy. Bismarck wished for a period of peace in order to consolidate the Empire, and avoid war with Austria-Hungary or France. The latter especially had to be isolated to prevent a war of revenge. Bismarck succeeded by making a complicated alliance system: the *Dreikaiserbund* (1871), the Dual Alliance with Austria (1879), the Triple Alliance with Austria-Hungary and Italy (1882) and the Reinsurance Treaty (1887) with Russia. Bismarck presided at the Berlin Conference (1878), claiming to wish to avoid colonial involvement, but protectorates were established later in South West Africa and the Cameroons.

German foreign policy changed with the accession of William II: The Reinsurance Treaty with Russia was not renewed, leading to a Franco–Russian Alliance in 1894. More colonies were sought, Germany supported the Boers in South Africa against the British and the German navy was enlarged, leading Britain to ally with France and Russia. Crises occurred in the Balkans and Morocco. Austria continued its alliance with Germany, thus after the assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian throne at Sarajevo in June 1914, Germany supported Austria's demands. Germany's foreign policy had changed from 1890. William pursued *Weltpolitik* but was frequently inconsistent in his approach.

**12. Analyse the successes and failures of one post-First World War treaty.**

This will probably be a popular question, with the majority choosing the Treaty of Versailles. The Paris Peace Conference took place in Paris from 18 January 1919 to 20 January 1920. The following treaties were produced: Versailles with Germany, St Germain with Austria, Neuilly with Bulgaria and Trianon with Hungary. The Treaty of Sèvres with Turkey was not published until 10 August 1920 when it was accepted by the Sultan. However it was rejected by the republic of Atatürk, and revised as the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923. Brest-Litovsk (March 1918) could also be chosen.

Whichever treaty is chosen, one success could be that the treaty was agreed and published, and a weakness that the defeated states did not take part in the negotiations and resented this. The treaties established a degree of self-determination, and it was hoped that the newly founded League of Nations would be able to rectify any weaknesses or injustices.

Details will depend on the treaty chosen, and be prepared for more weaknesses than strengths, especially with Versailles. The answer must be focused on the treaty, not on the rise of Hitler, and note that the “guilt clause” applied to Germany and its allies. For a “good” mark candidates should discuss individual clauses, and point out strengths and weaknesses, rather than writing generalized unsupported criticisms.

Failures might focus on the areas of each treaty which left lasting resentments, leading to future problems – such as the mandate system and Revisionism.

**13. Assess the importance of the Palestine Mandate (1920–1948).**

The main focus of most answers will probably be that violence and tensions within the mandate caused instability in the region with long-term consequences. There is much material that can be used to illustrate tensions such as the contradictions of wartime diplomacy (MacMahon–Hussein correspondence, Balfour Declaration), Wailing War Riots, Arab General Strike (1936) and failed Commissions. Continued violence post-1945 highlighted British weakness.

Higher level marks should be reserved for those answers which assess “importance”. Accept any relevant material such as references to UNSCOP activity which highlights how important Palestine was in international terms.

**14. “The father and founder of modern Turkey.” To what extent does this statement explain the role and policies of Atatürk?**

Mustapha Kemal Atatürk (1881–1938) assumed the patronymic Atatürk, meaning “Father of the Turks” in 1934, when he wished all Turkish families to adopt Western style surnames. If candidates focus on three aspects of his life and rule – founder, modernizer, and father – they should be able to focus their answer clearly.

As the “founder”, Atatürk had a successful military career during the Balkan and First World Wars, then began a nationalist revolution, organizing resistance to the dismembering of Turkey. He opposed the Treaty of Sèvres, and obtained revision of it in the Treaty of Lausanne. He gained control of Constantinople after the Chanak crisis, and abolished the sultanate in 1922. In 1923 a Turkish Republic was proclaimed with Atatürk as president.

As president, Atatürk sought to modernize – and secularize Turkey: he abolished the Caliphate, emancipated women, encouraged Western dress, introduced a Latin alphabet, developed industry and reformed education. He also tried to modernize and develop the Turkish economy. There was limited political modernization.

To what extent Atatürk was “father” of Turkey, is open to interpretation. He fostered national pride in Turkey rather than to Islam, and ruled as a dictator until his death.

**15. Compare and contrast the domestic policies of Hitler and Mussolini.**

Comparison: both authoritarian rulers, both fostered a Cult of Personality/strong leadership. Hitler – Fuhrer, Mussolini – Duce. Both used coercion and terror to control potential opposition (GESTAPO/OVRA). Both used propaganda effectively. Both attempted to reach accommodation with the Church. Education was controlled and Youth movements were established to indoctrinate the young. Leisure activities were also influenced by the government.

Both focused on the economy but the levels of government intervention varied (Four Year Plan, Corporate state, search Autarky).

Contrast: Hitler's domestic policies were underpinned by his desire to establish the racially pure Volksgemeinschaft. From 1935 anti-semitic legislation was passed to marginalise the Jews, in Italy Mussolini did not introduce anti-semitic policies until 1937, they were not rigorously applied.

The main contrast was the level of personal power, Hitler and the Nazis were totally dominant whereas in Italy traditional power centres such as the Church and to a lesser extent the monarchy remained influential.

*Do not demand all the above, and accept other domestic policies. If only Hitler or Mussolini is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**16. For what reasons, and to what extent, did attempts to achieve collective security between 1919 and 1939 fail?**

Collective security was a term widely used in international diplomacy between the wars. It implied that the security of individual states was guaranteed jointly by other states.

The League of Nations was responsible for implementing this policy especially in the 1920's. In the 1930's the term could be applied to the Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance Pacts (*e.g.* Franco/Soviet/Czech Pact 1936) which were signed to limit the aggression of the dictators. Reasons could also include the impact of the Depression.

Failure could be attributed to the weaknesses of the League, its loss of credibility in the 1930's after the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises. Failure to negotiate disarmament also undermined the credibility of the League. The British pursuit of Appeasement also weakened attempts to establish collective security. By the late 1930's states were pursuing policies independently of the League to protect their own security (Nazi-Soviet Pact August 1939). Failure could also be attributed to the more dangerous atmosphere of the 1930's.

**17. A colleague said of Stalin: “His last years were the most dangerous. He swung to extremes”. To what extent do you agree with this view?**

Candidates often ignore Stalin post-1945, except in relation to the Cold War. This question does also allow candidates to consider his earlier rule, as they could disagree with the quotation by giving and analysing dangerous policies, actions, *etc.* pre-1945, or even 1941. However, candidates will not score well if they just dismiss the quotation, and concentrate on his early years. The last years must be the focus, and candidates should not be penalized for only assessing his “last years”. Danger points in his early years could include collectivization and anti-kulak policy, purges, especially of Party and the military. But what the speaker probably was referring to was his attitude and behaviour within USSR and government after the war. Terror and purges were renewed, colleagues never knew where they stood with him, one day in favour, another fearing imprisonment or death.

Detail might include: the Leningrad Affair, the Doctors Plot, treatment of returning Russian POW’s, the marginalisation of Zhukov and the Red Army, the power of the MVD, all indicated Stalin’s ruthless control.

*It is hoped that this question will cause candidates to think, and write interesting thoughtful original answers. Mark what is there, and do not have a preconceived idea of what to expect or demand.*

**18. For what reasons, and with what results, was Khrushchev successful in the power struggle after Stalin's death in 1953?**

Khrushchev was to be perceived to be a loyal follower of Stalin, and his rivals underestimated his ambition and ruthlessness (seen during his wartime career).

Main contenders were Malenkov, Bulganin and Molotov as well as Khrushchev – all of them feared and disliked Beria who was swiftly arrested and shot by Zhukov after Stalin's death.

Khrushchev advantages included the support of the Red Army, his role as Party Secretary which he used to widen his support and outmanoeuvre his colleagues. He was also well known in Russia, travelling widely and listening to the people.

In 1956 he delivered his "Secret Speech" criticising Stalin and was able to survive attempts to remove him from the Central Committee because of his support in the party and his rivals subsequently resigned.

Results: Khrushchev dominated Russian government until 1964. He started a process of destalinisation within the Soviet Union and the satellite states (leading to unrest at times, Hungary and East Germany). He introduced progressive economic measures in the Soviet Union which helped improve external relations with the west and enabled him to pursue a policy of Peaceful Coexistence.

**19. Evaluate the reasons for the formation of NATO and the impact of its policies up to 2000.**

NATO was formed in 1949 after the division of Germany to defend western states against the threat of Soviet aggression. Member states included the USA, UK, France, Canada, Iceland's *etc.* In the fifties, West Germany, Greece and Turkey joined. The treaty committed its members to treat an attack on one as an attack on all. Members had to contribute to the NATO defence force under a multi-national command.

Impact: The Warsaw Pact was established to a response to NATO in 1955.

It was an effective deterrent during the Cold War but also had a role as peace keeper in tense situations (Suez, Congo).

It's policy of first strike attack was considered to raise tensions and increase the risk of nuclear war in the 1970's and early 1980's. Post 1989 NATO's role was redefined and although still defensive, NATO has much more frequently been perceived as a humanitarian task force deployed in various trouble spots (Balkan wars of the 1990's, Rwanda).

*If only reasons are addressed then no more than [8 marks]. Impact should be considered fully for higher level marks.*

**20. Analyse Franco's regime and explain why Spain became a democratic nation after his death in 1975.**

This question addresses Franco's Spain after success in the Spanish Civil War. In April 1939, the war ended and Franco became head of state, and presided over an authoritarian regime until his death in 1975. Some aspects of his regime to analyse are: the nature of his authority; relations with the Catholic Church; keeping Spain out of the Second World War; his anti-Communist stance which led to some rapprochement with the West, and the Bases Agreement with the USA; economic and educational reforms and modernization.

His modernization of the Spanish economy, the growth of tourism, *etc.* made it impossible to maintain a strict authoritarian state. He probably realized this, and thus he began preparations for a return to democracy. In 1969, Franco announced that when he died Spain should return to a monarchy under Juan Carlos, grandson of the last monarch. This was successfully accomplished and within two years, most traces of Franco's dictatorship had disappeared and Spain was established as a stable constitutional monarchy. Reasons *why* might be considered to be Spain's integration in the European community and modernisation of society.

**21. Compare and contrast the economic policies of Nasser and Sadat in Egypt.**

Comparisons: Both Nasser (1918–1970) and Sadat (1918–1981) realized that the Egyptian economy was weak, and tried to improve it; it remained poor in spite of their efforts. Also both their economic policies were affected by political considerations. As their economic policies differed considerably, candidates will probably find more to contrast, than compare. Both had authoritarian political systems.

Contrasts: Nasser’s policies were socialist. He nationalized the Suez Canal, guaranteed employment in the public sector, nationalized industries, sought to redistribute land, and aimed at self-sufficiency. He introduced free education, and to a certain extent did champion the middle class, but his most important economic policy was probably the Aswan Dam.

Sadat tried to distance himself from Nasser’s policies with his “open door” policy. He did consolidate the public sector, but allowed private sector growth, some capitalist measures related to a “free market economy”. The continued closure of the Suez Canal caused revenue losses. Sadat encouraged foreign trade, but this caused a trade deficit, and exports fell. A new upper class of merchants developed and inflation increased.

*If only Nasser or only Sadat is considered, mark out of a maximum of [7 marks].*

**22. Account for the uneasy relations between Israel and the Arab world between 1950 and 1993.**

In 1948 the United Nations Partition Plan was, in spite of much opposition, put into effect, and Palestine was divided into Arab and Jewish sectors. The new state of Israel was declared in May 1948. It was promptly invaded by the armies of Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon. The Israelis won, and occupied more territory than had been allocated to them. A million Palestinian Arabs fled to refugee camps, and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was formed.

It is not necessary for candidates to explain and recount the pre-1950 problems in full, but the situation between 1948 and 1950 could be considered a reason for uneasy relations between Israel and the Arab world. Other points to consider could include: refugee problems; the issue of occupied territories; refusal of many Arab states and organizations to recognize Israel; the various wars fought between the two, e.g. Suez War 1956, Six Day War 1967, 1973 October or Yom Kippur War; failure of peace talks, including Camp David Agreement and Israeli PLO agreement (1993); Arab terrorist movements, including PLO and Hamas; Israeli invasion of Lebanon (1982); wealth of Israel and poverty of Palestinians; religious and ethnic differences.

*Candidates should be well-informed on this topic, but do not expect or demand all the above.*

**23. In what ways, and with what results, was there an “industrial revolution” in *one* country of the region in the fifty years you have studied?**

Candidates can select one country, and any 50 year period – it does not have to be 1800–1850, 1850–1900, 1900–1950 or 1950–2000. “In what ways” suggests an explanation of the “industrial revolution”, and the results can cover: effects on industry; life style; riches and poverty; demands for increased education, especially technical education and training; leisure; housing; transport; increased status of the selected country; trade, especially for raw materials; *etc.*

Details will depend on the country chosen, but specific evidence must be presented.

**24. With reference to *one* country of the region, *either* in the nineteenth century *or* the twentieth century, analyse the importance of *two* of the following: health reforms; gender issues; immigration; emigration.**

Health reforms would require both medical advancement and legislation, including legislation to improve environmental conditions to improve health.

Gender issues would cover issues such as education, training, employment opportunities, discrimination, the franchise, family responsibilities, leisure, sport, health care, *etc.*

Immigration could include: reasons for it; position of immigrants in a new country, welcome or unwelcome; language problems; employment and/or unemployment; racial ghettos; integration; *etc.*

Emigration could include: situations that produced emigration; effects on original country; shortage of labour; countries favoured for emigration, *etc.*

*If only one topic is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks], and allocate at least [8 marks] for the weaker topic if the answer is unbalanced.*

---