



# **MARKSCHEME**

**May 2013**

**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 the IB Assessment Centre.*

*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, 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 are 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.

**The French Revolution and Napoleon — mid eighteenth century to 1815**

- 1. “The poor judgment of Louis XVI was responsible for the destruction of the monarchy in France by 1793.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should consider how Louis XVI’s poor judgment may have contributed to the outbreak of the revolution. They should consider his policies, his choice of ministers and the fact that he allowed his wife’s extravagance. Consequences of other decisions he made, such as involvement in the American War of Independence and his decision to summon the Assembly of Notables and then the Estates General, should also be considered. Balanced answers will also consider the underlying discontent and inequities in French society and make a judgment which was more important.

Answers will also have to consider the period between the outbreak of the revolution and Louis’s execution in 1793. Did his poor judgment with regard to the Estates General lead to the storming of the Bastille? What were the problems with the establishment of the constitutional monarchy? What were regarded as treasonable dealings with foreign powers (for example the flight to Varennes)? All these factors, along with others, are appropriate for consideration.

- 2. Assess the impact of the domestic policies of Napoleon in France in the years 1799–1814.**

Candidates should know the key policies of Napoleon both as First Consul and Emperor (legal, administrative, social, religious, economic, educational, *etc*). The key word in the question is “impact” and answers should focus on this. Were reforms/policies effective? Did they change French social and political life? He did restore law and order but he also established an authoritarian monarchy with extensive censorship and virtually a police state. Foreign policy is not relevant here except when it had an impact at home – such as a deteriorating economy because of wars.

## Unification and consolidation of Germany and Italy 1815–1890

### 3. Why was the Italian nationalist movement so ineffective in the years 1815–1848?

Reasons for ineffectiveness could include a lack of popular support. The movement was one that had most support amongst the educated middle classes. This is the group that Mazzini sought to influence. There were internal divisions within the movement. The secret societies of the Adelfia and the Carbonari had different goals.

There was also a lack of leadership. Mazzini was a thinker not a political leader. It was also difficult for him to reconcile his antimonarchical views with the need to use the monarchy to defeat foreign powers.

Charles Albert of Piedmont was inconsistent in his support for nationalism as he was primarily concerned with strengthening Piedmont. There was no political party to support nationalism as Italian Liberalism was a loose consensus of ideas and not a party. Gioberti had no support in Rome until the election of Pius IX in 1836 and even then the Pope was lukewarm about the idea of a Federation of Italian states.

Probably the most significant reason for weakness was the strength of Austria and Metternich's determination to retain control in Italy. Austria was able to deal swiftly with discontent/uprisings and her power ensured that Italian nationalism was largely ineffective.

### 4. How successful were Bismarck's domestic policies in the years 1871–1890?

To assess "success" candidates should identify Bismarck's goals which included: to fully unify the empire and not just in constitutional terms; to deal with internal enemies (*Reichsfeinde*: Catholics, socialists, national groups); to maintain Prussian dominance and restrict the power and influence of the Reichstag, to strengthen the empire economically. Candidates should then consider the extent to which these goals were achieved.

Key policies included: the *Kulturkampf*, anti-socialist legislation to attempt to limit the growth of the Social Democrats. Additionally State Socialism was designed to gain the support of the working class. He attempted to control national groups with a policy of Germanization, which fostered resentment. Bismarck also encouraged continued industrial growth by adopting protectionist policies.

The Bismarckian constitution was designed to ensure Prussian dominance within the federal empire and his shifting alliances in the Reichstag ensured that the Reichstag remained weak.

## **Ottoman Empire from the early nineteenth to the early twentieth century**

### **5. How and why did the major powers intervene against Muhammad Ali in the 1830s?**

There were two Muhammad Ali “crises” in the 1830s: one in 1832 and one in 1839.

How did the powers intervene? In 1832 the Russians supported Turkey after the military success of Ibrahim Pasha in Syria left Constantinople vulnerable. Simultaneously the British and the French were pressuring Muhammad Ali (dispatching fleets to the Mediterranean) to make peace.

Why? Nicholas I was convinced that preserving the Ottoman Empire was in Russia’s best interest as it would also strengthen Russian influence in the area (achieved with the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi 1833). Britain and France were worried that Russia would gain even more influence if the situation was not stabilized.

1839: The French encouraged the Egyptians’ ambitions in the hope of extending their own influence in North Africa. Palmerston intervened to get a four power agreement to the London Convention 1839 (Great Britain, France, Prussia and Austria). All agreed on the need to maintain the Ottoman Empire but gave Egypt to Muhammad Ali as a hereditary holding.

Britain bombarded Alexandria and Beirut to force Egyptian agreement and also the presence of the British fleet weakened French support for Egypt.

Russia saw this as an opportunity to divide France and Britain. Russia’s significant position in the region was reduced by the Straits Convention of 1841 which closed the Dardanelles to all warships.

This is complicated material and sometimes detail may be limited but answers should focus on “how and why”.

*If only “how” or “why” is addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**6. Assess the Ottoman Empire’s role in the outbreak of the Crimean War (1854–1856).**

This is essentially a “causes” question and requires candidates to judge how significant the Turkish contribution was to the outbreak of war.

Causes could include: disputes over the Holy Places and the Russian demand that she be recognized as the protector of Orthodox Christians in the Ottoman Empire which raised tensions in the region. The Sultan felt this undermined his sovereignty and rejected the demand. He was supported by the British and French, who sent fleets to Besika Bay. Britain supported Turkey to maintain the Ottoman Empire. The French supported Britain as they wanted an alliance with Britain and because Napoleon III had to respond to the concerns of French Catholics. The naval response exacerbated tension.

In 1853 the Sultan rejected the compromise offered by the Vienna Note. He was convinced he had British and French support (their fleets were anchored at Constantinople) and in October he declared war on Russia. The Turkish fleet was destroyed at Sinope and there was fear that the Ottoman Empire would be partitioned. British public opinion was hostile to Russia, which contributed to Britain and France signing an alliance with Turkey in 1854. Russia had rejected demands to evacuate Moldavia and Wallachia and war was declared in March 1854.

Turkey’s role was very much that of a catalyst – the Sultan’s hardline with Russia was a consequence of his belief that he had the support of Britain and France (possibly reinforced by Stratford de Redcliffe). Russia was also responsible as she was always trying to extend her influence in the Balkans. Britain and France did not make clear their level of commitment to maintaining the integrity of the Ottoman Empire.

## Western and Northern Europe 1848–1914

### 7. “In spite of frequent crises the Third French Republic was stable up until 1905.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Established in 1871 as a stop gap after the abdication of Napoleon III with a majority of royalists in the Assembly, the republic remained relatively unchallenged until the emergence of socialism in the years before the First World War.

The crises referred to could include: the struggle to finally agree on a republic and establish a constitution up to 1875–1876, the elections of 1876 to resist “the republic of Dukes”, the threat from Boulangism, the Panama Canal Scandal, the Honors Scandal and the divisions caused by the Dreyfus Case.

The republic remained relatively stable for a number of reasons: there was no suitable monarchist candidate, popular support for the republic; a constitution which gave the predominantly republican legislature more political power than the presidency meant the right wing was never able to effectively launch a coup. Despite apparent divisions the left would always unite to defend the republic “No enemies on the left”. There was public support for policies such as the secularization of the state. Governments, despite frequent change, were inherently stable and experienced, as although jobs changed, the same people tended to remain as ministers ensuring relative continuity in policy making.

### 8. Assess the impact of social reform legislation in Britain in the years 1850–1900.

Candidates should be able to identify some of the key welfare reforms of the period: Gladstone passed education and public health acts, Disraeli passed a number of social reforms, such as laws relating to slum clearance and housing standards, laws which regulated the quality of food and drugs, river pollution, *etc.* There was legislation which allowed the growth of the Trade Union movement which could arguably be classed as social reform.

All governments, whether Liberal or Conservative, continued to gradually improve education provision.

Impact: the vast majority of children received at least a basic education by the turn of the century, improving literacy levels, although secondary education remained, to a large extent, only available to the better off.

The impact of reforms aimed at improving health were arguably less successful, illustrated by the fact that 50% of volunteers for the Boer war were medically unfit. Evidence from the Rowntree and Booth Reports also indicated the high levels of poor housing and poor health in urban areas.

This is not a question on the liberal reforms of the first decade of the twentieth century.

Candidates who answer with reference to the period after 1867 only should not be penalised. If candidates answer with reference to the extension of the franchise there must be clear links to the issue of social reform



## **Imperial Russia, revolutions, emergence of Soviet State 1853–1924**

### **9. To what extent do you agree that Alexander II transformed Russian society?**

The reforms of Alexander II will be well known, the major ones include:

- Emancipation of the Serfs 1861
- local government reforms – zemstva and дума
- legal reforms – trial by jury, independent judiciary
- education reforms – extension of secondary schools and more independence in the universities, reduction of censorship
- military reforms
- attempts to modernize the economy.

The focus of the question is the extent of change, analysis of the impact of reforms will be necessary for higher level marks. Possible points:

- Peasants remained tied to the Mir as a consequence of the burden of Redemption dues.
- Local government tended to be dominated by the nobility. There was no elected national assembly.
- Legal reforms led to the most extensive change as the population had more protection from arbitrary police action. Political cases were often tried separately.
- Education reforms led to the growth of an educated middle class. This group proved problematical as they demanded further reform.
- Military reforms lead to a better educated and more egalitarian army, although exemptions for the nobility were relatively easy.
- Economic change was slow, emancipation did not lead to the emergence of a prosperous peasant class, the nobility used compensation payments to pay off debts rather than invest in Russian industry.

The major change was the emancipation of the serfs but even that was limited as they remained firmly at the bottom of the social hierarchy which otherwise changed very little. Political power remained largely with the autocracy.

**10. Assess the impact of the Russo–Japanese War on the reign of Nicholas II up to 1914.**

The immediate impact of the war was to add to the growth of opposition to the regime. This was shown initially by peasant resistance to conscription and the strikes and demonstrations of 1905 throughout Russia. Nicholas was forced to issue the October Manifesto thus the impact of the war seemed to be significant political change. However “assess” requires candidates to consider how much real change there was. The Fundamental Law of 1906 ensured that the autocracy retained ultimate political power and Stolypin’s repression of opposition reinforced that power. Adjustment of the electorate over the next few years ensured a State Duma that was manageable.

It could be argued that the major impact was the emergence of political opposition groups such as the Social Democrats and Social Revolutionaries into the political arena. Also the growing awareness of the underlying weakness and incompetence of the regime.

In terms of foreign affairs, one impact of the war was the decision to strengthen relations with Britain and France by signing the Triple Entente (1907), which impacted on Russo–German relations.

This is not a “causes” of the February 1917 Revolution question, although some reference could be made to it.

## European diplomacy and the First World War 1870–1923

### 11. Discuss the significance of the Alliance System on European affairs in the years 1871–1914.

This is a complex question and answers would benefit by (a) defining the term “Alliance System” and (b) by being broken up into two distinct periods, 1871–1890 and 1890–1914. Some detailed knowledge of the various alliances is required.

Nations sign alliances to ensure their own security, in order to make themselves strong enough to deter potential threats.

In the earlier period Bismarck’s system of alliances was essentially designed to ensure that France was too isolated to seek a war of revenge and to maintain peace in Europe in order to allow the new German Empire to flourish. Alliances such as the Dreikaiserbund meant that two potential enemies were allied to Germany. His complex system and use of diplomacy (for example Congress of Berlin) helped resolve various crises.

In the second period in the 1890s the Dual Alliance (Russia and France) and the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria–Hungary and Italy) also seemed to help maintain the balance of power. In the early years of the twentieth century the signing of the Entente Cordiale and Triple Entente seemed to disturb that balance by involving Great Britain and by dividing Europe into two camps. Candidates could argue that the various crises of the first decade of the twentieth century seemed to strengthen the bonds of each alliance and made them rigid and inflexible by 1914. On the other hand they could argue the fact that they were fairly evenly balanced meant that crises were resolved avoiding war (Bosnia and the Balkan wars).

Reward answers which focus on “significance” and which have well-developed analysis.

### 12. Examine the reasons for, and the consequences of, the United States’ entry into the First World War in 1917.

Causes could include: the fact that United States’ financial interests were already committed to the Allies. More immediately, the German decision to reintroduce the policy of unrestricted submarine warfare (February 1917) and the Zimmerman Telegram (March 1917) generated public support for the war. The final obstacle to American entry was overcome with the fall of Tsarism in Russia. The war could now be presented as a “war for democracy”.

Consequences could include: a huge increase in potential resources for the Allies in a war of attrition, at a time when Germany’s resources were almost exhausted. US entry into the war seemed to break the stalemate on the western front.

In January 1918 Wilson made a statement of war aims, the Fourteen Points, which encouraged Germany to seek an armistice after the failure of the Ludendorff Offensive in the spring of 1918.

## War and change in the Middle East 1914–1949

### 13. “Atatürk transformed the political, economic and social structure of Turkey.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Atatürk’s key policies will be well known – a new constitution establishing equal rights and eventually (in 1934) universal suffrage. The introduction of civil law and the abolition of the Caliphate were all designed to reduce the influence of religion as was banning the fez and the chador. The development of industry such as textiles, improvements in education, the introduction of the Roman alphabet could also be commented on.

The key word here is “transformed” – how much did Turkey change? The Sultanate was replaced by a dictatorial regime with one party (RPP) dominating. Islam continued to have a major influence, particularly in rural areas. Economic developments tended to be limited to urban areas and educational improvements were also slower in rural areas. There was a clear divide between the urban modern society and traditional rural society.

### 14. Analyse the reasons for Israeli success in the Arab–Israeli conflict (1948–1949).

The traditional view is that Israel was successful in the conflict because of the Israeli determination to survive as a nation state – that is, not to be driven into the sea, in addition to the fact that the Arab leadership was divided which undermined their efforts. More recent analysis agrees with this broad picture but offers more in-depth analysis of the events of 1948–1949.

- Militarily Israel was not outnumbered as both sides had roughly similar numbers of troops available. However Israel was better organized – they used the first truce of June 1948 to purchase armaments so were better equipped.
- The Israeli Defence Force was better trained – many of its soldiers had fought with Britain in the Second World War, whereas the only fully trained and disciplined unit on the Arab side was the Arab Legion.
- Israel had better funding, financial support from all over the world whereas the funds on the Arab side were limited.
- The Israelis had a clear goal: the forceful establishment of their state, which they had been planning for several years.
- The Arabs lacked leadership and planning. They were divided as to their goals. Abdullah of Jordan’s main aim was to gain control of the West Bank and not the destruction of the Israeli state. He never attacked Israeli territory.
- The Arab states were suspicious of each other – Syria and Egypt were deeply suspicious of Jordan, which made planning difficult. As a consequence of this disunity Israel was able to deal with her opponents one by one.

Answers should make an assessment as to which of the reasons were more important for the Israelis’ success.

### Interwar years: conflict and cooperation 1919–1939

#### 15. Evaluate the methods used by Mussolini to gain and retain power in the years 1919–1926.

Methods used to gain power could include: flexible policies. He completely changed his manifesto after failure in the 1919 election. He made an electoral alliance with Giolitti, so he used the parliamentary system to his advantage. He gained the support of the Church and the traditional elites in Italy by exploiting their fear of communism.

He also used violence and the threat of violence. The tactic of Squadristo during the Biennio Rossi effectively weakened the left but also undermined the Liberal state which appeared ineffective in contrast. The threat of force was the planned March on Rome if he was not given the premiership.

Methods to retain power were similar: he used his position in the state to strengthen his position by “legal” means – the Acerbo Law 1923, and beginning the establishment of the Corporate state.

He used violence against the opposition (for example, the murder of Matteotti). He continued the use of Squadristo in order to reinforce the need for a strong leader. Once in office he continued to gain the support of the elites. The army was happy he left Victor Emmanuel III in place. He began negotiations with the church which resulted in the Lateran Accords (1929).

“Evaluate” invites candidates to make a judgment as to which methods were more important or even whether it was a combination of these methods, which allowed Mussolini to exploit the weakness of the Liberal state.

*If only “gain” or “retain” are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

#### 16. “Hitler had clear foreign policy aims but no plan of how to achieve them.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Hitler’s aims need to be stated clearly. Basic answers will assert that he sought *Lebensraum*. Better/more developed answers may argue that he had a range of goals: the removal of the terms of Versailles, incorporating all Germans into the Reich, and, in the longer term, gaining *Lebensraum* in the east.

Candidates should consider the extent to which Hitler planned his foreign policy initiatives. Was there a timetable or did he seize opportunities? Some candidates may make reference to historians’ theories (particularly well-known ones such as Bullock and Kershaw) but this is not a requirement for higher level marks.

Leaving the League of Nations and Rearmament policies reduced the impact of Versailles. The Reoccupation of the Rhineland in 1936 after the collapse of the Stresa Front when Britain and France were preoccupied by Abyssinia may be considered. He exploited Britain’s policy of Appeasement and her fear of communist expansion to gain Austria and the Sudetenland. Even his signing of the Nazi–Soviet pact could be deemed opportunism as this happened after the failure of the Anglo–French mission to reach an agreement of the Soviet Union in 1939.

Whichever line of argument is chosen it must be supported by detailed knowledge of events.

## **The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe 1924–2000**

### **17. Assess Stalin’s role in the collapse of the wartime alliance.**

Candidates will have to examine Stalin’s actions in the closing stages of the war both at conferences and as the Red Army liberated Eastern Europe from Nazi control. They will also have to examine his actions in the post-war period, both in Germany over the issues of four power control, reparations *etc* and in the states of Eastern Europe where Soviet satellites were established to form a buffer zone.

Other areas to consider are the actions of the other powers and how they might have damaged the Alliance – such as the US use of the Atomic Bomb, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid.

Answers might also argue that the alliance was never likely to survive for very long after victory over the Nazis as that was the one goal that had kept it together.

### **18. Examine the extent of political change in Russia in the years 1991–2000.**

Changes include – the collapse of the USSR and the establishment of the CIS (Commonwealth of Independent States) and, later, the Russian Federation. The introduction of a democratic multiparty state and the introduction of a new constitution were massive changes.

However, aspects of politics seemed to change very little. The Communist Party and its allies had a strong presence in the State Duma for the first few years. There was still strong authoritarian leadership under Yeltsin as his attack on the White House in December 1993 demonstrated. He had the power to appoint prime ministers and he frequently dismissed them if they disagreed with him. Putin was his last prime minister. In 1999 he was nominated as Yeltsin’s heir apparent and when Yeltsin resigned he easily “won” the 2000 election. Thus answers could argue that the democratic process was not fully functioning in Russia (*eg* the role of the FSB) and that the tradition of one dominant leader continued after the fall of the Soviet state.

## **The Second World War and post-war Western Europe 1939–2000**

### **19. Why were the Axis powers defeated in Europe in the Second World War (1939–1945)?**

The main focus will no doubt be on Germany but Italy, as the other main Axis power in Europe, should be considered.

One area to consider is the lack of resources. Italy had very few resources and much of her military resources had been used in Abyssinia and Spain. Germany did not have the resources to fight a long, drawn-out war and the failure to defeat Britain meant that the war continued until the US entry into the war December 1941.

Both Germany and Italy were overstretched with regards to troops and resources and Italy's military weakness meant that Germany became even more overstretched with troops in North Africa, the Balkans, Greece *etc* and finally in Italy itself from 1943. After June 1941 the Eastern Front began to drain the resources of the Axis powers.

The Allies had greater resources in terms of men – not only Britain, but also her empire was involved in the conflict. The entry of the US in December 1944 added to the available manpower and also economic resources. The invasion of the USSR also added to the numeric superiority of the Allied forces.

Strategic mistakes by the Axis powers were also important. Hitler's decision to invade the Soviet Union whilst Britain was still undefeated involved the Germans in a war on two fronts in Europe, which had proved disastrous in the First World War. Hitler's unwillingness to listen to the advice of his generals frequently resulted in wasting resources (Stalingrad). Harsh treatment of conquered states led to resistance movements, which tied up troops, and the Allied bombing campaigns led to the collapse of morale in Germany.

This question is focused on events in Europe and the Pacific war is not relevant here.

**20. Analyse the reasons for Spain’s relatively peaceful transition from dictatorship to democracy in the years 1975–1977.**

In the 1960s some civil rights had been granted and along with economic growth and affluence there were increasing demands for a more democratic structure in Spain.

In 1969 Prince Juan Carlos was designated Franco’s heir as head of state.

In 1973 Carrero Blanco was assassinated leaving no political heir for Franco.

The state was increasingly run by technocrats and was becoming distanced from Franco’s personal rule. All of these factors seemed to indicate a move away from dictatorship once Franco died.

There were disturbances and violence in the early 1970s, strikes and demonstrations were led by the trade unions and an attempted crack down by the Civil Guard was largely ineffective – indicating the weakness of repressive forces.

On the death of Franco the trade unions acted as a bridge between the democratic elements in Spanish society and the technocrats of the Francoist state. They, along with political groups such as the Socialists, were anxious to avoid uncontrollable unrest. As a consequence, the move to democracy was achieved legally and in accordance with the popular demand.

Suarez, prime minister from 1976, oversaw the passing of the Law of Political Reform which was approved by the Council of Ministers and then a two-thirds majority in the Cortes. The referendum which followed gained a vote of 94% in support of reform.

Political parties were legalized and the winner of the 1977 election was Union of the Democratic Centre, many of whose members were former Francoist bureaucrats. The Church remained neutral and King Juan Carlos made his support for democracy clear. A new constitution was issued in 1978, guaranteeing democracy and equality before the law.



**Post-war developments in the Middle East 1945–2000****21. Examine the causes and consequences of the Intifada 1987–1993.**

Immediate causes: the trigger was the deaths of four young Palestinians in December 1987 in Gaza, caused by an Israeli army vehicle. Underlying causes were: military rule in the occupied territories and arbitrary arrests kept tensions high; the continuing confiscation of Palestinian lands which were transferred to Jewish settlers. The control of Palestinians moving in and out of the territories on a daily basis for work also led to deep resentments which rose to the fore in 1987.

Consequences: the Israeli “iron fist” response to the Intifada was ineffective and led to international criticism. In a search for a solution to the violence the US recognized the PLO and persuaded Yasser Arafat to reject terrorism and accept a two state solution (*ie* for the first time recognizing Israel’s right to exist). These changing attitudes led to the Madrid Conference (1991) and the Oslo Accords (1993) which seemed at the time to be the beginning of peace in the Middle East.

*If only “causes” or “consequences” are addressed, mark out of a maximum of [12 marks].*

**22. Analyse the reasons for the limited success of the Pan-Arab Movement in the years 1950–2000.**

A useful starting point would be to define Pan-Arabism, which was intended to resist foreign interference with the Arab Nation as a whole. Considerations of social justice were also an important feature of the movement.

Impetus was given to the movement after the defeat of the Arab states in the 1948–1949 conflict with Israel. Nasser was the first leading politician to support the notion of Pan-Arabism, which transcended state borders. The end of the Suez Crisis was presented as a victory for the Arab world and not just Egypt.

In 1958 the UAR was formed but lasted only until 1961. The main reason for this was that Syria felt dominated by Egypt and this was a key reason for its limited success. The context had changed. Pan-Arabism was no longer needed to resist colonialism which had largely ended. Many rulers of the Arab states felt their power threatened by Pan-Arabism. Inter-state tensions also limited the success of the movement. Egypt was isolated to some extent after making peace with Israel in 1979. Conflicts such as the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait also indicated the limits of Pan-Arabism.

The movement has been to some extent superseded by the Arab League which has played an important role with regard to the Palestinian question and social and cultural issues whilst respecting individual state sovereignty.

**Social and economic developments in Europe and the Middle East in the nineteenth or twentieth century**

- 23. With reference to *one* country of the region and *one* fifty year period, examine the social and political impact of immigration.**

Whichever country is chosen, answers should be supported with accurate detailed knowledge.

Social impacts could include: hostility from local populations leading to violence, segregation of communities into immigrant and non immigrant areas, the emergence of multicultural states.

Political impacts could be both positive and negative impacts: the positive could be the enactment of legislation to prevent discrimination and a greater awareness in the whole nation of civil rights. Negative impacts could be the emergence of political groups hostile to immigration.

- 24. With reference to *one* country of the region, examine the consequences of changes in the media on society up until 2000.**

Candidates should support their answers with specific evidence. They are likely to focus on the second half of the twentieth century but credit answers which focus on earlier periods if well supported.

Areas that could be explored could be the growth of electronic media such as television, internet *etc*, the speed of communication.

This is not a question about the growth of social media which developed extensively post 2000.

There should be consideration of the impact on society for example a better informed more politically aware population or the possible destabilizing effects of the media.

---