



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 2013**

**HISTORY**

**Route 2**

**Higher Level and Standard Level**

**Paper 1 – The Arab–Israeli conflict  
1945–79**

*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.*

*For the attention of all examiners: if you are uncertain about the content/accuracy of a candidate's work please contact your team leader.*

**1. (a) What, according to Source C, were the immediate consequences of the Suez Crisis? [3 marks]**

- Nasser emerged as a hero.
- Nasser suppressed the Muslim Brotherhood even more severely and cracked down on anyone else he considered a threat.
- Nasser had successfully defied Britain, France and Israel.
- Arafat and the Palestinians hoped to benefit from the changing circumstances, but their hopes were dashed.
- Student activists were kept under surveillance.

*Award [1 mark] for each relevant point up to a maximum of [3 marks].*

**(b) What is the message conveyed by Source B? [2 marks]**

- Egypt (symbolized by Nasser) has control over the transport of oil supplies as it has nationalized the Suez Canal. (Please note Egypt has no oil, therefore do not credit responses indicating that Nasser is rationing Egyptian oil.)
- Foreign powers led by Britain, France and the US are queuing to get oil, which is controlled by Nasser.
- The foreign powers are only allowed a very limited amount of oil, as indicated by the small oil cans.

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

**2. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and E about the Suez Crisis of 1956. [6 marks]**

**For “compare”**

- Both sources indicate that the US and the USSR became more influential in the region.
- Both sources claim that Nasser’s status in the Arab world grew.
- Both sources regard the outcome of Suez as being a setback for Britain and France.

**For “contrast”**

- Source A explicitly discusses the role of the United Nations, although Source E only refers to the role of individual countries.
- Source A claims that Britain and France were militarily effective at Suez, whereas Source E claims that Suez exposed their weaknesses and/or E shows the Arab cause in a more positive light.
- Source A gives no indication of the declining influence of Britain and France, whereas Source E clearly states they lost influence.
- Only Source E regards the Suez episode as changing the image of Israel in the Arab World.
- Source A mainly concentrates upon describing the sequence of events during the Suez Crisis, whereas Source E mainly focuses on the consequences of the Crisis.

Do not demand all of the above. If only one source is discussed award a maximum of **[2 marks]**. If the two sources are discussed separately award **[3 marks]** or with excellent linkage **[4–5 marks]**. For maximum **[6 marks]** expect a detailed running comparison/contrast. Award up to **[5 marks]** if two sources are linked/ integrated in either a running comparison or contrast.

3. **With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source C and Source D for historians studying the Suez Crisis of 1956.** **[6 marks]**

**Source C**

Origin: Extract from a book by Tony Walker and Andrew Gowers, *Arafat – The Biography*, 2003.

Purpose: To describe and analyse the life of Arafat and his influence in Middle Eastern affairs.

Value: Gowers has considerable experience in the Middle East. The book has the advantage of hindsight on the Suez Crisis, having been written almost fifty years after the event.

Limitations: The book is specifically about Arafat and is therefore not explicitly focused on the Suez Crisis. The authors’ area of specialization is finance and they are not experts in the historical significance of Suez. The authors are both journalists and are from the Western world, which might have influenced their analysis of events.

**Source D**

Origins: Extract from *The Arab–Israeli Wars* by Chaim Herzog, former president of Israel and a former high ranking Israeli army officer, 2004.

Purpose: To provide information about and analyse the Arab–Israeli wars, and to provide an Israeli perspective.

Value: Herzog was president of Israel from 1983 to 1993 and was a former high ranking officer in the Israeli army. He would therefore have access to classified military information and would have had direct experience of the 1956 Suez Crisis. Also since it was written 50 years later, Herzog could have had access to a wide range of sources that were unavailable at the time.

Limitations: The book covers all four of the Arab–Israeli wars and is not specifically focused on Suez. As a former member of the Israeli government and military, he is unlikely to be critical of Israeli actions but would be highly critical of the actions/policies of Arab nations. Since the book was published nearly 50 years after the event, it could be that Herzog’s recollections are clouded.

Do not expect all of the above. Ideally there will be a balance between the two sources, and each one can be marked out of **[3 marks]**, but allow a **[4/2 marks]** split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of **[4 marks]**. For a maximum of **[6 marks]** candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

4. **Using the sources and your own knowledge, analyse the consequences of the Suez Crisis for the countries involved up to the end of 1959.** *[8 marks]*

**Source material**

- Source A: The Suez conflict altered the regional balance of power. It was a military defeat for Egypt, but Nasser's status grew in the Arab world as the defender of Arab nationalism. In broader terms, it marked a significant power shift away from Britain/France towards the US/USSR.
- Source B: Nasser became an important figure in the Arab world, and Egypt gained control of the Suez Canal and oil supplies to the West. The presence of Uncle Sam in the queue showed that the Suez Crisis made even the US vulnerable.
- Source C: Nasser emerged a hero in the Arab world and strengthened his power in Egypt. The Suez Crisis was also, perhaps surprisingly, a setback for the Palestinian cause.
- Source D: The United Nations assumed the role of peacekeeper in the Sinai, as it became a buffer zone between Israel and Egypt. The enhanced position of Egypt and the United Nations' evident readiness to yield to Egyptian pressure created problems for the future.
- Source E: Suez established Nasser as the most important Arab leader and the Suez Crisis stimulated Arab nationalism. Britain and France were forced to leave Egypt, ending their dominance of the Arab world. Arab leaders turned to Cairo, Washington and Moscow. Israel's invasion, in collaboration with the old imperial powers, gave Israel a poor image in the Arab world. This was a worrying sign for the future.

**Own knowledge**

Israel withdrew from Egyptian territory gained in the fighting, but regained access to the Straits of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba. It claimed that any restriction of access to these waters would be considered an act of war in the future. The United Nations Emergency Force played a key role maintaining peace in the Sinai after the withdrawal of British and French troops from the Canal Zone, although there was still tension along the border between Egypt and Israel. Mollet and Eden received severe criticism at home. Eden resigned as prime minister and was replaced by MacMillan. Relations between the United States and Britain and France deteriorated following the crisis. The Middle East became an integral part of the Cold War, and the Eisenhower Doctrine was passed in 1957 which promised American economic aid and/or military support to countries in the Middle East who were under threat. Egypt made short-term economic agreements with the Soviet Union and China. By 1959, Fatah had been established, led by Yasser Arafat, and had become the voice of the Palestinian people.

Do not expect all the above and accept other relevant material. If only source material or own knowledge is used the maximum mark that can be obtained is *[5 marks]*. For maximum *[8 marks]* expect argument, synthesis of source material and own knowledge, as well as references to the sources used.