



# **MARKSCHEME**

**November 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. Analyse the impact of Napoleon’s invasion of Egypt in 1797.**

Candidates should be able to set the invasion in the context of war with Great Britain. Egypt was strategically important as a possible route to India. There was also a desire to spread French culture and influence into the region. It was an opportunistic campaign against a weak Ottoman empire.

Consequences could include: losing the campaign; increase in western influence in the region; weakening of Ottoman control of Egypt – a contributory factor in the emergence of Muhammed Ali as Egyptian leader.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for accounts dominated by the military campaign, with little or no reference to causes and consequences.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers which are unbalanced and concentrate on either causes or consequences.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for answers which are evenly balanced between causes and consequences but with limited analysis.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for detailed analytical answers which can identify a number of causes and demonstrate clear understanding of the consequences, probably focusing on short-term.

**[17+ marks]** for answers which can identify causes and consequences, and identify both short and long-term consequences – *i.e.* the beginnings of the “eastern question”.

**2. Assess the reasons for the emergence of Islamic reform movements in the nineteenth century.**

Candidates may draw on reformers from the whole region including Al-Afghani, Muhammed Abduh or Sayyid Ahmed Khan. Causes could include a reaction to the spread of Western influence, or the need to modernize and strengthen Islamic states. Biographical answers are unlikely to score highly.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate 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. Arguments with limited examples and analysis.

**[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.

**3. Analyse the short- and long-term causes which led to the Great Revolt in 1857.**

This question invites candidates to examine in depth the causes of the revolt. Areas to consider would be discontent of the Sepoys, Princes, and rural poor, because of British interference in a range of matters, including religion, territory (Oudh), agriculture, culture (Macaulay) *etc.* The question implies a reaction to British influence rather than the birth of Indian nationalism. A narrative account of the events of 1857 would not score well unless the nature of events was linked to the question.

*N.B.* If only short- or long-term causes are dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalized answers, which may refer to key events such as the “greased cartridges”, but go no further.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narratives of background causes. Candidates may mention Bentinck and Dalhousie’s policies but with no developed comments.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more detailed narratives with some attempt to assess both long and short term causes.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, detailed answers which focus fully on underlying causes rather than the events of 1857, although candidates may refer to these to substantiate points.

**[17+ marks]** for fully developed assessments, with candidates considering whether 1857 was a reaction to British rule or the beginnings of Indian nationalism. Candidates may make apt references to historiography.

4. **“The Tanzimat reforms had limited impact on Ottoman society in the years 1839–1876.”  
To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates should know the major reforms and understand that the aim was to strengthen the Ottoman Empire. The focus of the reforms was military, educational, legal and provincial administration. A focused assessment of impact in these areas is required, particularly education, religion, law and the economy. Good answers will be able to comment on the variable impact of the educational reforms, *e.g.* removed from control of the Ulema in 1847 but real educational developments were mainly in towns and cities with little impact on rural areas. Legal reform was gradual and consisted of a series of compromises, with the adoption of new penal codes and commercial codes based on European procedures and the Mejlle, which represented a compromise between Sharia and secular law. Candidates may argue that the Tanzimat reforms began the process of modernizing and secularizing the Empire, but that real impact was limited to towns and cities and not completed until after 1922.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for limited, often inaccurate, accounts of the reforms.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for accurate narrative, with clear understanding of aims but with no developed comment on impact.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for a more detailed narrative with some understanding of impact but that does not cover all aspects of the reforms.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for analytical comment on the variable impact, with consideration of the extent to which aims were achieved.

*[17+ marks]* As above, but may additionally consider continued European economic importance, and the fact that secularization was not achieved until the collapse of the Empire; candidates may see Tanzimat as the early stages of a long process.

**5. Why and with what results did Britain occupy Egypt in 1882?**

The major factor was obviously shared ownership of the Suez Canal, more immediately the financial crisis of the Khedive Ismail and his refusal to accept advice which led to his replacement by Tewfik – leading to Urabi Pasha’s revolt. Anti-European rioting and anxiety about the Canal led to the bombardment of Alexandria and ultimately Tel-el-Kabir. Britain, and to a lesser extent France, were forced to act because of Ottoman indifference/distraction. British remained in Egypt because of the defeat of the Egyptian Army by the Mahdist rebels. British “occupation” was to some extent always regarded as unofficial. Candidates may consider the Cromer period as a key result, where British influence is very clear.

*N.B.* If only one part of the question is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general answers which emphasize the Canal alone.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for reasonably detailed accounts of the event of 1882.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for detailed accounts plus some attempt to analyse a range of factors.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for developed analysis which prioritizes factors.

**[17+ marks]** as above, but with developed analysis which shows that British intervention was a consequence of Egyptian internal problems, not planned expansionism.

**6. How important were economic and religious tensions as causes of the outbreak of civil war in 1860 in Lebanon?**

This is not directly “a causes of the civil war” question but it seeks an understanding of the general situation. Answers should show an awareness of the main confessional groups (Druze, Maronite Christians, Sunni and Shia Muslims). However other factors such as economic disparities between landlord and peasants, political weakness of Ottomans and the impact of foreign powers (Britain, France, Egypt) must be considered.

*N.B.* If only one part of the question is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

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

**[8 to 10 marks]** for an outline of various religious groups with little consideration of other factors.

**[11 to 13 marks]** as above, but with a wider range of factors mentioned and a limited analysis of their significance.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a genuine attempt to discuss the “significance” of religion as one of a range of problems.

**[17+ marks]** for fully developed analysis which may see religion as a convenient explanation for instability.

7. “The Government of India Act in 1858 led to fair and efficient government (in the years 1858–1919).” To what extent do you agree with this statement?

Candidates will have to identify the forces of Indian nationalism (Indian National Congress (INC) and the Muslim League) and what their aims were. An examination of how far the act satisfied these aims given the limited nature of change under the system of Dyarchy. Additional legislation *e.g.* Rowlatt Acts and events such as Amritsar could also be considered in conjunction with the 1919 India Act. Candidates may consider the events of the next few years (the entry of Gandhi into nationalist politics and his mobilization of the masses) which essentially transformed the forces of nationalism in India from a middle class movement.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for a limited account of Indian nationalist movements and some general reference to the 1919 Act.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a narrative account of events in the early twenties, which may focus too much on Gandhi’s role.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for a more balanced narrative with attempt to consider the impact of legislation.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for a well-developed and detailed answer synthesizing all the factors which transformed Indian nationalism into a mass movement (piecemeal change by Britain plus Gandhi’s role in raising national consciousness).

**[17+ marks]** as above, but candidates may also consider various historiographical interpretations of events. It may also be argued that in some ways the act was irrelevant to the changing nature of Indian nationalism, which had increased tempo as a consequence of the First World War.

**8. How successful was the Committee of Union and Progress in achieving its aims in the years 1908–1921?**

Candidates will need to identify clearly the aims of the Young Turks – the end of Abdul Hamid’s despotism and the removal of corrupt, inefficient government. However, it is also necessary to make clear that there were divisions among the revolutionaries, with liberal elements often at odds with the Committee of Union and Progress (CUP) who desired the revival of a powerful state. The realization of these must be considered for a fully developed answer. Succession of Mehemet V as a more amenable Sultan. CUP came to dominate politics, resorting to ruthless methods. Parliament dissolved after the Enver Bey coup, so politically it was not very liberal. There were some reforms of the tax system and improvements in provincial government. CUP were clearly unsuccessful in establishing a strong Turkish state, as illustrated by ultimate defeat in 1918.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for vague general answers, where knowledge is not always accurate.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative accounts of events with little focus on aims or realization.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more detailed accounts which consider both 1908 and events subsequent to it. Analysis may not be fully developed.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed knowledge and analytical comment focused on both the issues in the question.

*[17+ marks]* as above and with perceptive comments on the limited nature of change as a consequence of 1908 – candidates may even challenge the use of the word “revolution”.



**9. Analyse the impact of the 1905 Revolution on Iranian society and politics.**

Areas to consider could include the causes of the revolution in order to make a judgment about “extent of change”. Causes could include: the autocratic nature of the Shah’s regime; resentment at foreign interference, particularly economic; desire for modernizing and strengthening the State.

Post-1905–1906 issues could include: effectiveness of the Majlis, country still poor and backward, financial crisis of 1911–1912.

There was no real modernization until after Reza Shah’s coup in 1921. The 1907 Anglo-Russian *Entente* virtually divided Iran into their spheres of influence – so foreign influence was still very strong. Candidates may end at 1914 or may consider a broader timescale and go up to the 1921 coup.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate 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, and for an argument with limited examples and analysis.

**[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.

**10. Compare and contrast the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 with the Treaty of Sèvres in 1920.**

Non-Turkish territories were lost, for example, Smyrna to Greece, Turkey therefore to some extent was being treated as a defeated nation, the Empire was divided up into mandates in the Arab territories and the Western powers were able to extend their influence in the region. Turkey was very weak.

Lausanne was negotiated as a consequence of Atatürk's revolution and overthrow of the Sultan. The Straits remained independent, Turkey a sovereign state, and the principle of national self-determination was adhered to (Anatolia and Smyrna). Turkey regained some territory in Thrace including Adrianople and Constantinople.

Lausanne made it clear that Turkey was an independent state; however there was no reduction in British and French control of mandates (former territories of the Ottoman Empire).

*N.B.* If only contrasts are made, award a maximum of **[7 marks]** and then only if answers are very detailed.

**[0 to 7 marks]** and below for vague general comments on both treaties.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for more detailed sequential descriptions of both treaties.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for detailed knowledge and some structured comparisons, with contrasts developing.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for clear, fully detailed running discussions of the two treaties, but with underdeveloped analysis of why they were so different.

**[17+ marks]** for answers as above, but with clear analysis linked to the contexts in which both treaties were made.

**11. “Attatürk was the founder of a modern democratic state.” To what extent do you agree with this statement?**

Candidates will know the reforms: establishment of the republic; secularization of the state; introduction of female suffrage; introduction of civil marriage; divorce reform; extension of education particularly in rural areas.

However, there should be clear analysis of the extent to which Turkey was modernized and also how democratic it was. Comment could be made on the slow rate of change particularly in rural areas, economic change and growth – some industrial development occurred. The level of secularization could be questioned with the continuing influence of Islam, levels of democracy could also be questioned with the RRP, the only party.

*N.B.* If only modern or democratic is considered, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general accounts of Attatürk’s career.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for more detailed knowledge of policies but with little focused comment.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for full accounts of reforms with some analysis of the levels of change.

**[14 to 16 marks]** as above, but with more critical analysis and more developed comments on the extent of modernization and democracy.

**[17+ marks]** for well-developed arguments which examine fully both elements. They may well consider long-term impact of the regime.

**12. Analyse the reasons for and consequences of the Egyptian Revolution of 1952.**

Causes of the revolution of 1952 could include: militant nationalism (British still in occupation); social and economic stagnation; weak corrupt government and monarchy; military defeat of 1948 *etc.* Emergence of Nasser – his dominance of Free Officers and support in the army. Najib was a figurehead. Regent in 1952 – monarchy abolished in 1953 and Nasser deputy Prime Minister – in a government dominated by Free Officers.

Answers will probably be dominated by the causes of revolution but there should be some comment on Nasser's emergence to score higher marks. This is not a question on Nasserism.

*N.B.* If only reasons or consequences are dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague general comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for a general narrative account of events in post-war Egypt with little or no comment on causes.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more detailed knowledge of events and more extensive analysis of causes.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that deal well with both aspects of the question. Analysis is likely to be more focused on revolution.

**[17+ marks]** for answers which clearly consider the full range of factors. Candidates may also try and assess the significance of each factor and may identify 1952–1954 as a transitional period.

**13. To what extent was wartime diplomacy a major factor in causing tensions in Palestine in the years 1918–1939?**

Candidates will need to examine wartime diplomacy, Sykes-Picot, MacMahon-Hussein correspondence and the Balfour Declaration, as well as other factors such as economic disparity between Arabs and Jews, the impact of land purchase and immigration, religious difficulties and conflicting British policies, before reaching a judgement on the contribution to tensions.

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

*[8 to 10 marks]* for narrative, descriptive accounts or unbalanced answers, which do not focus on the issue of wartime diplomacy.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for narrative or descriptive accounts, unbalanced answers or implicit or underdeveloped answers.

*[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. Why did the aims and methods of the Indian Nationalist Movement become more extreme in the years 1919–1939?**

Gradual and limited nature of reform in post-war period. Some discussion is required of the provision of 1919 and 1935 Government of India Acts (*e.g.* 1935 Act to grant full dominion status). Contents of Simon Commission Report, limited dialogue with nationalists at Round Table Conferences (no INC representatives at first conference).

Other factors: response to Amritsar 1919, influence of Wilsonian ideals of self-determination. Gandhi's role in mobilizing the masses. British response to his non-violent tactics leading to increasing support for full independence.

*N.B.* If only aims or methods are dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for vague general comments.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for answers that show knowledge of key events and legislation and that probably have some emphasis on Gandhi's importance.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for thorough knowledge of events that show some awareness of Indian frustrations and therefore increasing militancy in the Indian Nationalist movement.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for answers that synthesize all the factors mentioned, such as mass support and increased consciousness of Indian identity and anger at limited concessions, especially compared to White dominions. Resentment of perceived British attempts to pursue "Divide and Rule" policies.

**[17+ marks]** for answers as above, but probably with comment on changing attitudes to the notion of colonial empires and the desirability and possibility of achieving self-determination.

**15. Examine the significance of economic and political factors in the development of the Tamil nationalist movement after 1948.**

Reasons for Tamil nationalism are the main focus here and could include examination of government policies which were perceived to be discriminatory [education, constitutional, linguistic] and which seemed to limit the opportunities for the Tamil minority. Detail could include the 1948 Citizenship Act, which disenfranchised Indian Tamils and caused anxiety to Ceylon Tamils, the establishment of Sinhala as the official language, the unitary system of government, which allowed Sinhalese areas to dominate, discrimination in the public service, *etc.* Some answers may link all this to resentment of British policy, which appeared to favour Ceylon Tamils plus the rapid process of decolonization, which failed to protect minorities. For higher mark bands candidates should make a judgement, even if it gives equal weight to both factors.

*N.B.* If only one factor is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for general narrative accounts of post-independence Sri Lanka.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for some mention of tensions.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more detailed accounts, which begin to clearly outline the link between policies and tensions.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analysis which is not fully developed, but that considers a full range of policies.

**[17+ marks]** for fully developed analysis which identifies causation and which may try to explore how justified Tamil grievances were.

**16. Compare and contrast the extent of social and political change in any two Arab states since 1945.**

Answers should use specific details from their chosen case study. Balanced answers will examine both political and social developments. Factors which may be considered could include political change/stability, nature of the constitutional structure, levels of democracy, *etc.* Social factors could include gender issues, religious issues, education and welfare, *etc.*

*N.B.* If only one state is dealt with, award up to a maximum of **[7 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for generalized answers which lack specific reference to any one state.

**[8 to 10 marks]** for narrative of political or social change.

**[11 to 13 marks]** for more specific detail with a reference to both politics and society, although the answer may be unbalanced.

**[14 to 16 marks]** for analytical, well-balanced answers (equal balance between politics and society) but the answer may not consider all aspects.

**[17+ marks]** for a fully analytical, wide-ranging answer, that addresses all aspects of the question.

**17. Analyse the reasons which contributed to King Hussein of Jordan’s long reign (1952–1999).**

Answers should be able to outline the problems that Hussein survived, his succession in 1953, political opposition in 1956, problems of Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) and Black September, internal criticisms of policies towards Israel, financial difficulties *etc.*

Factors which could be considered could include: political skills; suppression of opposition/destabilising factors such as the Palestinian refugees; and the contribution made by the external support of the US in terms of aid.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for limited biographical accounts.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for accounts which have some detail but have limited comment on political skills.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more detailed comment on his political skills (*e.g.* attempts at reform in the late 1980s to increase support).

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed answers where there is developed comment on political skills.

*[17+ marks]* for answers which consider a number of means of survival and which may argue that effectively they are all “political”.

**18. Compare and contrast the policies of Nehru and Indira Gandhi**

Answers should identify key policies of both and detail their aims. Areas such as the economy (Five Year Plans, industrial development, pursuit of socialist goals), social equality (caste, equal rights for women), population limitations, education, *etc.*

Contrast might include: Indira’s more aligned foreign policy and a more authoritarian style of government (this is not an opportunity to describe the reasons for the state of emergency).

*N.B.* If only one leader is dealt with, award up to a maximum of *[7 marks]*.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for generalized answers which lack specific details.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for answers which are able to identify key policies, although possibly not all. Candidates may see continuity between Nehru and Indira Gandhi.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more detailed knowledge and for questioning levels of continuity.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for answers which clearly identify continuities and discontinuities.

*[17+ marks]* for answers which do not only comment on continuities and discontinuities but may also comment on methods of implementation, *e.g.* Nehru “encouraged” social change and Indira was willing to use more forceful methods.



**19. Why was Pakistan so politically unstable in the years 1947–1971?**

Reasons why could include rapid partition process which meant that Jinnah and the Muslim League had limited opportunity to plan a political structure, Jinnah's pre-eminence and Liaquat Ali Khan's dominance of the political scene meant their deaths left a vacuum. There were problems of corruption in politics. The military had a high profile because of disputes with India and when civilian politicians failed to establish stability, the logic was for high profile military leader to step in. Reference to the extent of democracy under Ayub Khan and Yahya Khan will be important here.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for a general, undetailed chronological account of governments since 1947.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for a more detailed knowledge of events.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for good knowledge that considers democracy, but that may also uncritically accept its weakness.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for a fully detailed answer with analysis that begins to explore the reason "why".

*[17+ marks]* for a fully developed analysis that explores a whole range of factors.

**20. Assess the importance of foreign policy in the overthrow of the Shah of Iran in 1979.**

Reza Shah's regime was authoritarian from the mid-1950s. Opposition was repressed until 1977 (state control of Majlis and activities of Savak). Despite the White Revolution there were still great disparities in Iranian Society, the Mullahs were very influential with urban poor (disapproval of Westernization). Iranian society was very conservative. Relaxation from 1977 onwards allowed discontent to become open. Reza Shah's policies were uncertain at this time – he was still determined to maintain personal power, but he was unable to build moderate support by conciliation and went into exile in January 1979. In terms of foreign policy the main focus was close relationships with the USA, thus foreign policy merely exacerbated internal tensions.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general accounts of the events of 1978–1979.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for more detailed answers, but that still focus closely on 1978–1979.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for broader considerations of the regime. Answers may bring in assessment of success/failure of the White Revolution.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed consideration of policies and analysis of the nature of the regime e.g. divisions between traditionalists and modernizers.

*[17+ marks]* for wide-ranging consideration of tensions in Iran – political, social and economic. Candidates may comment that Reza Shah's position weakened from 1977 onwards when repression was relaxed and the regime had no broad base of support to rely on.

**21. To what extent did the Palestinian refugee issue act as a catalyst for civil war in Lebanon in 1975?**

Areas to consider could include: the fragility of the confessional system; growing demands for political reforms Lebanese National Movement (LMN); the impact of urbanisation; economic difficulties; leading to the growth of militias; problems caused by Palestine Liberation Organization raids on Israel and clashes between the army and the militias. A complicated picture with the need to understand the position of Palestinians.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for limited, inadequately supported, accounts of Palestinian presence

*[8 to 10 marks]* for basic narrative of events 1974–1975.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for more detailed accounts which identify a range of causal factors, but with limited significant analysis.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for detailed answers where factors are prioritized. Answers may see the tensions caused by Palestinians as a key factor.

*[17+ marks]* for analytical answers which place the civil war in the context of the Lebanese political and economic structure, identifying underlying weaknesses and tension.

**22. Assess the role of Arab nationalism in causing conflicts between Israel and her neighbours between 1948 and 1973.**

Candidates will need to look at all four conflicts and make some judgement as to the significance of Arab nationalism, opportunism in 1948, outside intervention 1956, *etc.*

1948–1949 nationalism plus some attempt by Arab states to gain land *e.g.* Jordan (West Bank).

1956 Suez – defensive on the part of Egypt but partly caused by Nasser’s nationalist stance and desire to weaken British and French influence in the region.

1967 – all Arab states were driven by nationalist considerations, whereas Israel’s actions were defensive.

1973 – the causes were more complex, PLO activities kept the Palestinian refugee question at the forefront and Arab states such as Egypt felt obliged to keep the issue alive internationally, however Sadat’s motivation for war may have been more complex. Many historians argue that he saw a change in the situation as an opportunity to get on better terms with the US. Possibly leading to peace talks later in the decade.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate 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. Arguments may have limited examples and analysis.

**[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 impact of Cold War rivalries on the region in the years 1945–1977.**

Both the USA and USSR sought allies in the region because of oil (USA) and its strategic significance. (USSR worried about pro-Western regimes in Turkey and Iran.)

Iran signed the Baghdad Pact 1955, USSR supported Nasser over Suez (Egypt remained non-aligned). USA post-Suez adopted Eisenhower Doctrine to safeguard oil and counterbalance Soviet influence (most successful in Lebanon, Jordan, Iran (also 1979) and Israel).

Impact of the Cold War: essentially both superpowers were trying to maintain influence in the region and at times of crisis would cooperate to safeguard their own interest (e.g. 1973 Yom Kippur). The situation was always fluid.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for answers which outline relationships to superpowers with inadequate detail.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for detailed answers which describe the various alliances.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for detailed knowledge with some explicit analysis showing why both powers were interested in the region.

*[14 to 16 marks]* as above, but also perhaps showing how regional states used Cold War issues to their own advantage.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed analysis and answers which may argue that the Cold War had little impact on the region and that certainly in terms of ideological commitments, the changing relationships with various states support this view.

**24. For what reasons and with what results did Iran and Iraq go to war in 1980?**

Many answers will see the main reason as opportunism, as Iranian armed forces were weakened after the Islamic revolution had deprived them of many officers.

Other factors could include disputes over the Shatt al Arab waterway and Iraqi claims to border the territory of Khuzestan. Saddam was also anxious about the spread of Islamic fundamentalism. His regime was Sunni dominated, however a large Shi'ite minority could cause problems. Saddam may also have been motivated by a desire to gain support from Western powers who were hostile to Khomeini's regime in Iran. Other reasons could include a possible diversion from domestic issues such as a low standard of living and/or a means of unifying Iraqis.

Results: great instability in the Middle East as some states such as Jordan and Kuwait supported Iraq whereas other states such as Syria, Libya and Algeria were critical of Iraq. Oil supplies to the West were threatened, war dragged on for seven years, there were huge numbers of casualties on both sides, and economic dislocation.

*N.B.* If only one area is discussed, award a maximum of **[12 marks]**.

**[0 to 7 marks]** for unsubstantiated generalizations, inadequate 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. Arguments may have limited examples and analysis.

**[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. With reference to *one* specific state in the region, analyse the impact of religion on educational developments.**

Answers should include details of educational provision/change and should not just be generalized statements. Real analysis of societal change (if any) as a consequence of educational developments is required.

*[0 to 7 marks]* for general comments on the nature of educational change.

*[8 to 10 marks]* for more specific knowledge of extension of education provision.

*[11 to 13 marks]* for detail as well as uncritical assertions that education has facilitated change.

*[14 to 16 marks]* for well-focused, analytical answers, supported by relevant knowledge.

*[17+ marks]* for detailed knowledge and critical analysis of the extent of change, which may have been limited by the conservative nature of societies or limited financial support.

---