

Markscheme

May 2015

History route 2

Higher level and standard level

**Paper 1 – the Arab–Israeli conflict
1945–1979**

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 main causes of tension in the Middle East? **[3]**

- Border clashes between Syria and Israel and/or Palestinian attacks on Israel;
- Egypt's request for the removal of UN forces in the Sinai peninsula made Israel anxious;
- Cold War rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union, both of whom supplied weapons in the region;
- The Egyptian blockade of Eilat and/or Egypt moved troops into the Sinai;
- The USSR told Syria that Israel was massing troops on its northern border and this inflamed the situation.

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

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

- It demonstrates serious rivalry in the Middle East between the US and the Soviet Union, as shown by their size in the cartoon and/or by their confrontational postures (the fist-shaking and/or the gun holster and the sickle);
- That Israel and Egypt are using the US and the Soviet Union respectively for support;
- That the United Nations is not very influential as indicated by either its smaller stature or the fact that nobody is listening to its song;
- The cartoon suggests that the Israeli-Egyptian conflict in the Middle East is being exacerbated by the rivalry between the US and the Soviet Union.

Award [1] for each valid point up to a maximum of [2].

2. Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources D and E about the tension in the Middle East.

[6]

For “compare”

- Both agree that there was hostility and/or bad feeling between Israel and Syria;
- Both agree that there was increasing violence towards Israel; Source D refers to the Syrian regime’s support of Palestinian guerilla groups and Source D refers to the increased “number and severity” of attacks on Israel;
- Both agree that Israel’s response became more severe. Source D suggests that “Israeli retaliation intensified”. Source E states that “Israeli responses against Syria increased”.

Marking note: Candidates should be awarded [2] if they conflate the second and third bullet points and argue that both sides inflicted **increasing** violence on the other.

For “contrast”

- Source D states that “the superpowers had little to do with the immediate causes of the Six Day War”. Source E, however, mentions the Soviet Union spreading “false reports”, thus indicating a contrasting perspective of the level of involvement of the superpowers;
- Source D implies that the tension is very much limited to Israel and Syria whereas Source E draws in the wider region, specifically Jordan and Egypt, and hints at broader opposition to Israel, thus contrasting the scale of tension in the region;
- Source D suggests that a major contributory factor was a change in the Syrian ruling elite, whereas Source E emphasizes the contributory role of the Superpowers and/or the role of the Arab media in stirring-up Arab popular opinion against Israel.

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

3. With reference to their origin and purpose, assess the value and limitations of Source B and Source E for historians studying events in the Middle East in the lead up to the Six Day War of 1967.

[6]

Source B

Origin: A statement released by the US President on 23 May 1967 identifying the causes of tension in the Middle East just before the outbreak of war in June 1967.

Purpose: To highlight the concerns of the United States about the imminent threat to peace in the Middle East, to encourage and/or persuade the UN to broker a peace and to foster a return to armistice agreements.

Value: It is directly from the US President and so clearly represents official US government policy. He would be fully cognizant with the facts. It is of the time.

Limitations: It is unclear at whom the statement is aimed and who President Johnson's audience is. The origin of the source means that it is only giving the US view and may, therefore, be partisan. Some candidates may point out that the statement was issued in late May 1967 and cannot have an understanding of the events that would unfold in June 1967.

Source E

Origin: Eugene Rostow, who had been Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs during the period 1966 to 1969. It is an article written in 1993.

Purpose: To provide analysis of issues in the Middle East in relation to UN Resolution 242.

Value: Rostow is likely to have been an expert on politics in the Middle East. As an Under Secretary of State he would have access to information at the highest level. Some candidates may utilize the date of the source and argue that Rostow could have access to fuller information and/or benefit from hindsight. Some candidates may, correctly, infer that the Rostow was part of the US establishment and the article could, therefore, be justifying both US policy and Rostow's own role in making and/or delivering that policy.

Limitations: Rostow may have been writing from an official perspective. The article could have been justifying governmental policy. Some candidates may utilize the date of the source and suggest that it may have been influenced by Rostow's hindsight of the situation.

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], but allow a [4/2] split. If only one source is assessed, mark out of [4]. For a maximum of [6] candidates must refer to both origin and purpose, and value and limitations.

4. “The causes of the Six Day War of 1967 had little to do with Cold War tensions.” Using the sources and your own knowledge, to what extent do you agree with this statement? [8]

Source material

- Source A This source makes reference to the superpowers supplying arms to both sides making conflict more likely. It claims that the USSR raised tension by its report to the Syrian government that Israel was preparing to attack Syria. There is also reference to Israeli threats and the Egyptian–Syrian defence pact indicating that the origins of the conflict were local tensions.
- Source B This source shows the deep concern of the United States over the breakdown of the armistice agreements and it highlights the imminent dangers to the situation in the Middle East. As such, this source suggests the deep involvement of the US in the Middle East situation. The reference to the UN indicates that the US wishes to work in collaboration with other powers, including the USSR, to resolve the crisis.
- Source C This source could be interpreted as showing the superpowers using their client states Israel and Egypt to pursue their goals. The fact that they are shaking their fists at each other indicates Cold War tensions. Source C also shows the weakness of the UN in seeking to calm the situation.
- Source D This source clearly shows that the superpowers had little involvement in the immediate causes of the war, instead it implies that the war was caused by tensions between Israel and the Arab states. The source also refers to “accusations and threats” that raised the level of tension.
- Source E This source shows that there was major Soviet involvement through the spreading of “false reports”; disinformation that may have acted as a goad to Egypt and President Nasser. It also makes reference to attacks on Israel from Syria and Jordan leading to conflict.

Own knowledge

Own knowledge could include: the fact that there had been no peace settlement at the end of the 1948/1949 war; that Israel was anxious about the growing power of Egypt as a consequence of military support from the USSR; that Egypt’s standing as the leading Arab power post-Suez encouraged Nasser to make moves against Israel; that the failure of the United Arab Republic (UAR) may have encouraged more aggressive responses by Nasser. Some historians argue that Nasser was trying to divert attention from Egypt’s difficulties in Yemen. There were increased tensions in the region because of Israeli plans to divert the River Jordan, which would be damaging to Jordan. In 1964 the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) was recognized by Arab states as the official representative of the Palestinians, raising the profile of the refugee problem and encouraging the PLO to step up guerrilla attacks.

The sources and own knowledge could be used to argue either that the causes of the 1967 war were the result of regional tensions and that Cold War tensions were incidental. Or they could argue that superpower support gave both Israel and Egypt the confidence to push the tensions to military conflict.

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