



MARKSCHEME

May 2014

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 A, were the problems of peacemaking in the Middle East between 1973 and 1978? [3 marks]

- The process was complicated and involved several nations – reference to “shuttle diplomacy”;
- Not all parties were eager for peace: “step by reluctant step” (eg in the Sinai) and the process often stopped; mention of “deadlock”;
- Peace negotiations were complicated by other issues such as the OPEC (Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries) oil embargo and détente;
- Begin was hostile to any peace negotiations which included representatives of the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization).

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]

- Kissinger plays an important role in the Middle East peace process; this could either be supported by the caption on the plane or inferred from the suggestion that significant media attention was focused on his visits to the Middle East;
- He is “travelling hopefully” with the desire to establish peace, and the trip involves several nations;
- He was welcomed by political and military representatives, showing their commitment to the peace process;
- The presence of bodyguards suggests the situation was tense;
- Kissinger is moving very fast and frequently between countries.

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

2. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources C and E about the peacemaking process in the Middle East in the 1970s. [6 marks]

For “compare”

- They both indicate an international effort for peace and refer to UN Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 242;
- They both agree that the aim is for lasting peace and some progress, for example respect for the borders, has been made in this regard;
- They both indicate that peace negotiations involve three Middle East nations: Israel, Egypt and Syria;
- Source E refers to “step-by-step” negotiations and Source C illustrates this approach by referring to agreements reached at different stages. Both sources indicate that the peace process moved slowly;
- They both recognise the role of the US.

For “contrast”

- The emphasis upon the role of the superpowers is much greater in Source C, than in Source E. Source E focuses upon the role of the UN and the agreements between Egypt, Syria and Israel, while Source C concentrates more on the activities of Kissinger and Brezhnev (although it does mention the UN);
- Source E makes more general statements about the basis of peace such as recognition of borders, mutual recognition *etc.* Source C contains detail on how this is to be achieved (*eg* Western parts of Sinai, Golan Heights *etc.*); Source E does not mention how peace was to be maintained;
- Source C clearly states that the United Nations would have a supervisory role in maintaining peace: the reference to the “no man’s land” on the western banks of the Suez in Sinai. It also makes reference to the United Nations Disengagement and Observer Force. On the other hand, Source E is less specific with regard to the UN’s supervisory role.

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 A and Source D for historians studying the peace process in the Middle East.** **[6 marks]**

Source A

Origins: It is written by D Little, an American professor of History, in 2010, as part of the Cambridge History of the Cold War.

Purpose: To examine the conflict and the peacemaking process in the Middle East up to the Camp David Accords.

Value: An academic perspective on events, appearing in a publication of an internationally renowned University; likely to be well-researched; the date of publication allows time for reflection; the book was published 30 years after these events and was not seeking to advance US interests in the Middle East.

Limitations: The author may be influenced by an American perspective, overemphasizing the importance of Kissinger. Since the source covers a broader period, it is not specific enough in its consideration of peacemaking in the 1970s.

Source D

Origins: An official UN resolution regarding the conflict in the Middle East in 1973.

Purpose: To state UN policy regarding the Middle East conflict in October 1973; to instruct countries to abide by UN policy in the conflict.

Value: It shows the method by which the ceasefire was to be implemented using United Nations forces. Its status as an official UN document suggests that it is valuable since it gives an insight into the approach of the international community. As a Security Council resolution it had to be agreed by all permanent members.

Limitations: It is relevant to a very specific period and does not deal with the ongoing peace process and what came next. In particular, it cannot tell us whether this resolution was applied or not. Palestine and the PLO did not have a seat in the UN so the UN did not represent all parties involved.

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. “The US was the driving force in the peace process in the Middle East between 1973 and 1978.” Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree with this statement? *[8 marks]*

Source material

- Source A: Refers to Kissinger’s shuttle diplomacy and to his role in the lifting of OPEC’s embargo in 1974. It mentions President Carter’s proposal for peace talks in Geneva. It also mentions President Sadat of Egypt’s bold initiative in flying to Jerusalem in November 1977.
- Source B: The cartoon shows Kissinger’s tireless shuttle diplomacy in the search for peace in the Middle East.
- Source C: Shows Kissinger’s involvement in the peace process over a three-year period. It also mentions other players, such as Brezhnev and the UN.
- Source D: Shows that United States forces were not on the ground implementing the ceasefire as they were permanent members of the Security Council. As such, they were not directly involved with peacekeeping which was essential to the whole peace process, rather it was the UN that was playing a key role.
- Source E: States the US was not solely responsible for peace; all the involved parties were responsible.

Own knowledge

Own knowledge could include: Egypt reopened the Suez Canal in 1975 significantly reducing tensions in the region; the UN General Assembly voted to put the Palestinian question on the agenda in 1974; the UN recognized the PLO as the official representative of the Palestinian people and it was granted observer status in the UN in 1975; Menachem Begin visited Egypt in December 1977; President Carter invited both Begin and Sadat to Camp David in 1978 to begin negotiations, which resulted in the Egypt–Israeli Peace Treaty, 1979.

Candidates may argue that US diplomacy acted as a stimulus for peace in the Middle East, but that the UN was important in a neutral supervisory role and the two complemented each other. Some could add further information on the specific role of Kissinger. They could also argue that the UN merely acted as an official stamp for US initiatives. They might also mention the role of the Soviet Union, especially during the October War.

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.