

Mark Scheme (Results) January 2010

GCE

GCE History (6HI01) Paper E

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Mark Scheme that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternately, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated **History** telephone line: **020 7190 4784**

January 2010

Publications Code US022877

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.
- Mark schemes will indicate within the table where, and which strands of QWC, are being assessed. The strands are as follows:

i) ensure that text is legible and that spelling, punctuation and grammar are accurate so that meaning is clear

ii) select and use a form and style of writing appropriate to purpose and to complex subject matter

iii) organise information clearly and coherently, using specialist vocabulary when appropriate.

GCE History Marking Guidance

Marking of Questions: Levels of Response

The mark scheme provides an indication of the sorts of answer that might be found at different levels. The exemplification of content within these levels is not complete. It is intended as a guide and it will be necessary, therefore, for examiners to use their professional judgement in deciding both at which level a question has been answered and how effectively points have been sustained. Candidates should always be rewarded according to the quality of thought expressed in their answer and not solely according to the amount of knowledge conveyed. However candidates with only a superficial knowledge will be unable to develop or sustain points sufficiently to move to higher levels.

In assessing the quality of thought, consider whether the answer:

- (i) is relevant to the question and is explicitly related to the question's terms
- (ii) argues a case, when requested to do so
- (iii) is able to make the various distinctions required by the question
- (iv) has responded to all the various elements in the question
- (v) where required, explains, analyses, discusses, assesses, and deploys knowledge of the syllabus content appropriately, rather than simply narrates.

Examiners should award marks both between and within levels according to the above criteria. This should be done in conjunction with the levels of response indicated in the mark schemes for particular questions.

At the end of each answer, examiners should look back on the answer as a whole in the light of these general criteria in order to ensure that the total mark reflects their overall impression of the answer's worth.

Deciding on the Mark Point Within a Level

The first stage is to decide the overall level and then whether the work represents high, mid or low performance within the level. The overall level will be determined by the candidate's ability to focus on the question set, displaying the appropriate conceptual grasp. Within any one piece of work there may well be evidence of work at two, or even three levels. One stronger passage at Level 4 would not by itself merit a Level 4 award - but it would be evidence to support a high Level 3 award - unless there were also substantial weaknesses in other areas.

Assessing Quality of Written Communication

QoWC will have a bearing if the QoWC is inconsistent with the communication descriptor for the level in which the candidate's answer falls. If, for example, a candidate's history response displays mid Level 3 criteria but fits the Level 2 QoWC descriptors, it will require a move down within the level.

Unit 1: Generic Level Descriptors

Target: AO1a and AO1b (13%)

(30 marks)

Essay - to present historical explanations and reach a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
1	1-6	<p>Candidates will produce mostly simple statements. These will be supported by limited factual material which has some accuracy and relevance, although not directed at the focus of the question. The material will be mostly generalised. There will be few, if any, links between the simple statements.</p> <p>Low Level 1: 1-2 marks The qualities of Level 1 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 1: 3-4 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 1: 5-6 marks The qualities of Level 1 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 1.</p> <p>The writing may have limited coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. The skills needed to produce effective writing will not normally be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
2	7-12	<p>Candidates will produce a series of simple statements supported by some accurate and relevant factual material. The analytical focus will be mostly implicit and there are likely to be only limited links between the simple statements. Material is unlikely to be developed very far.</p> <p>Low Level 2: 7-8 marks The qualities of Level 2 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 2: 9-10 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 2: 11-12 marks The qualities of Level 2 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 2.</p> <p>The writing will have some coherence and will be generally comprehensible, but passages will lack both clarity and organisation. Some of the skills needed to produce effective writing will be present. Frequent syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>

3	13-18	<p>Candidates' answers will attempt analysis and will show some understanding of the focus of the question. They will, however, include material which is either descriptive, and thus only implicitly relevant to the question's focus, or which strays from that focus. Factual material will be accurate but it may lack depth and/or reference to the given factor.</p> <p>Low Level 3: 13-14 marks The qualities of Level 3 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 3: 15-16 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 3: 17-18 marks The qualities of Level 3 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 3.</p> <p>The writing will be coherent in places but there are likely to be passages which lack clarity and/or proper organisation. Only some of the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing are likely to be present. Syntactical and/or spelling errors are likely to be present.</p>
4	19-24	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which relates well to the focus of the question and which shows some understanding of the key issues contained in it. The analysis will be supported by accurate factual material which will be mostly relevant to the question asked. The selection of material may lack balance in places.</p> <p>Low Level 4: 19-20 marks The qualities of Level 4 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 4: 21-22 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 4: 23-24 marks The qualities of Level 4 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 4.</p> <p>The answer will show some degree of direction and control but these attributes may not be sustained throughout the answer. The candidate will demonstrate the skills needed to produce convincing extended writing but there may be passages which lack clarity or coherence. The answer is likely to include some syntactical and/or spelling errors.</p>

5	25-30	<p>Candidates offer an analytical response which directly addresses the focus of the question and which demonstrates explicit understanding of the key issues contained in it. It will be broadly balanced in its treatment of these key issues. The analysis will be supported by accurate, relevant and appropriately selected which demonstrates some range and depth.</p> <p>Low Level 5: 25-26 marks The qualities of Level 5 are displayed; material is less convincing in its range and depth.</p> <p>Mid Level 5: 27-28 marks As per descriptor</p> <p>High Level 5: 29-30 marks The qualities of Level 5 are securely displayed; material is convincing in range and depth consistent with Level 5.</p> <p>The exposition will be controlled and the deployment logical. Some syntactical and/or spelling errors may be found but the writing will be coherent overall. The skills required to produce convincing extended writing will be in place.</p>
---	-------	--

NB: The generic level descriptors may be subject to amendment in the light of operational experience.

Note on Descriptors Relating to Communication

Each level descriptor above concludes with a statement about written communication. These descriptors should be considered as indicative, rather than definitional, of a given level. Thus, most candidates whose historical understanding related to a given question suggests that they should sit in a particular level will express that understanding in ways which broadly conform to the communication descriptor appropriate to that level. However, there will be cases in which high-order thinking is expressed relatively poorly. It follows that the historical thinking should determine the level. Indicators of written communication are best considered normatively and may be used to help decide a specific mark to be awarded within a level. Quality of written communication which fails to conform to the descriptor for the level will depress the award of marks by a sub-band within the level. Similarly, though not commonly, generalised and unfocused answers may be expressed with cogency and even elegance. In that case, quality of written communication will raise the mark by a sub-band.

Unit 1 Assessment Grid

Question Number	AO1a and b Marks	Total marks for question
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Q (a) or (b)	30	30
Total Marks	60	60
% Weighting	25%	25%

E1 The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
1	<p>The question is focused on attempts to unify Italy both politically and geographically, and the extent to which this had failed to be achieved by 1849. Answers may refer directly to the failure of the 1848 revolutions to bring closer unity with the lack of support for and defeat of the Piedmontese at Custoza 1848 and Novara 1849, the failure of the supporters of Gioberti to persuade Pope Pius IX to lead a federal Italy and the restoration of Austrian supremacy over Italy. Candidates may also support the suggestion with more general references to the uncertainty of nationalist aims and objectives, the tradition of localism and wide diversity of Italian society and culture and the narrow nature of and lack of support for Italian unity. Challenges to the suggestion may refer to the growing national revival in the period 1815-48, the increasing resentment of Austrian dominance, the development of the Italian language, the spread of nationalist ideas through the press and improved means of transport and the encouragement of Mazzini and the Young Italy movement to take direct action to unify Italy. Candidates could also suggest that despite the failure of 1848 to bring greater unity the legacy of the revolutions included the possibility of future Piedmontese leadership of a united Italy and resentment of the presence of both Austrian and French troops. A simple descriptive outline of some events will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who offer some analysis linked to the suggestion of lack of progress will access Level 3, though there may be passages of narrative. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the accuracy of the statement, though the answer may be unbalanced. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the accuracy of the suggestion of 'no progress'.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
2	<p>The question is focused on the significance of Garibaldi's success in Sicily and Naples in the unification of Italy and the extent to which it was the major reason for Italy becoming a unified state. Answers may refer to Garibaldi's expedition as a turning-point in a variety of ways, including the fact that before the invasion Cavour seemed to have limited Piedmontese expansion into northern and central Italy only, that Garibaldi's success allowed Victor Emmanuel to realise greater ambitions for Piedmont, that the romantic nature of the expedition created popular support for Italian unity and that fear of a radical government in the south necessitated the geographical unity of the Kingdom of Italy in 1861. Challenges to Garibaldi's intervention as the decisive turning point could be made by suggestions for alternative turning points such as the Pact of Plombieres in 1858, the end of the Austrian influence in either 1859 or 1866 and the occupation of Rome in 1870 or that the actions of Garibaldi were a significant but not decisive factor in a more complex process of unification. A simple descriptive outline of Garibaldi's intervention and/or the process of unification will be marked in Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. At Level 3 will be those who begin to assess the significance of Garibaldi's intervention as a factor in the unification process, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the impact of Garibaldi's actions in the unification process in relation to other factors/events, although at this level response may lack balance. At Level 5</p>	30

	there will be some attempts to assess the extent to which Garibaldi's expedition was the 'decisive' turning point in Italian unification.	
--	---	--

E2 The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
3	The question is focused on the political legacy of the 1848 revolutions and the reasons why Austria continued to dominate Germany in the years to 1862. Answers may refer to the inability of nationalist and liberal middle-class revolutionaries to create a unified Germany, the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament to persuade Prussia to accept the German Crown and the re-establishment of Imperial power in Austria closely followed by the rejection of the Erfurt Union and the 'Capitulation of Olmutz'. A simple description of the events which re-established Austrian dominance and kept Austria dominant will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will depend on relevance and range of accurate material. Answers which begin to provide an analysis of the extent to which the failure of the 1848 revolutions allowed Austria to remain the dominant German power will access Level 3, though there may be some sections of narrative material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent to which the failure of the revolutions allowed Austria to maintain its position in relation to other factors such as the relative political weakness of Prussia and the reluctance of other German princes to challenge the status quo. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the relative significance of failure of the revolutions compared to other factors. Better candidates at the higher levels may challenge the reference to the maintenance of Austrian power to 1862, perhaps suggesting that the failure of the revolutions led to an initial re-establishment of power but that the revolutions weakened Austria in the longer term.	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
4	The question is focused on the role of Bismarck in the final stages of the German unification process and the extent to which Bismarck was able to influence the key events. Answers may refer to the 'traditional' interpretation of Bismarck as having planned or manipulated the three key wars in the process of unification, the Schleswig-Holstein Crisis 1863-64, the Austro-Prussian War 1866 and the Franco-Prussian War 1870. Reference may also be made to Bismarck's diplomacy with the Alvensleben Convention with Russia 1863, the Gastein Convention with Austria 1865, the meeting at Biarritz with Napoleon III 1865 and the manipulation of the Hohenzollern Candidature in 1870. A simple description of Bismarck's contribution will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will depend on relevance and range of accurate material. Answers which begin to provide an analysis of Bismarck's role with implicit references to the nature of Bismarck's ability to influence events or suggest other factors will access Level 3, though there may be some sections of narrative material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the suggestion that Bismarck was 'wholly' responsible for unifying process by reference to alternative factors or situations. These may include the role of the Prussian King, the attitude of Napoleon III, economic developments such as the Zollverein, the weakness of Austria and chance factors. However, conflicting arguments may not be clearly and equally developed. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the accuracy of the suggestion by reference to the relative significance of Bismarck compared to other factors. Better candidates may refer to the differing significance of Bismarck over time	30

	perhaps suggesting that Bismarck could be viewed as 'responsible' for the process to 1866 but was overtaken by events in later years.	
--	---	--

E3 The Collapse of the Liberal State and the Triumph of Fascism in Italy, 1896-1943

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
5	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the weaknesses of the Liberal state in Italy and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the role of the North-South divide in this instability. Answers may focus on how regional differences in politics, economy and culture undermined the political efficiency of a united Italy. The relative economic and social underdevelopment of the south compared to the north affected economic progress and created potential support for political opposition. The dominance of the North in Italian politics allowed 'Transformism' to flourish, undermining parliamentary democracy. A simple description of weaknesses of the Liberal state will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the effect of the North-South divide, though there may be passages of narrative or descriptive material. Level 4 answers will focus on the North-South divide compared with other factors, although balance is not required at this level. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate the importance of regional disparity relative to other factors. Other factors may include inherent weaknesses in Italian parliamentary government, opposition groups, such as, the socialists and the Church, the emergence of nationalist politics and the failure of successive governments to take advantage of economic potential in general. The best answers may attempt to evaluate or integrate the conflicting arguments into an overall judgement.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
6	<p>The question is focused on the implementation Mussolini's economic policies and requires an analysis of the extent to which the policies were successful in improving the standard of living in Italy to 1943. Candidates could choose to evaluate the extent of improvement by reference to general economic change over time and/or by reference to different socio-economic groups or types of workers. Answers may refer to the nature of living standards within the context of the difficult economic situation inherited in 1922, the initial liberal economic policies that reduced unemployment and increased economic stability, the move towards protectionism resulting in economic problems before the Wall Street Crash, the policy of autarky introduced in the 1930s with the resultant 'battles for grain, land and births' and the economic difficulties during the war years. Candidates may suggest a negative balance sheet of improvement with reference to early recession, drop in income, rise in cost of living, increased control and repression in the work place, the failure of the 'battles' with more positive aspects such as increased access to electricity, public utilities, motorways and employment. A simple description of Mussolini's economic policies will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will depend on relevance and range of accurate material. Answers which begin to provide an analysis of success in relation to the standard of living will access Level 3, though there may be substantial sections of narrative material or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the extent to which living standards improved with reference to both positive and negative developments, although at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the extent of improvement for 'ordinary Italians', perhaps presenting conflicting arguments</p>	30

	in a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.	
--	---	--

E4 Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931-75

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
7	<p>The question is focused on the political instability in the Spanish Republic 1931-36 and the extent to which the traditional forces of political and social control in Spain, the landowners, the army and the Church, were undermined by radical republican policies. Answers may refer to the success of republican parties in the elections of 1931 and the introduction of a social revolution with policies designed to attack Church influence within the state and education, to reform the structure of the army, to nationalise the estates of large landowners and to favour the trade union movement. To evaluate the 'success' of these policies in undermining the forces of conservatism candidates may refer to the conservative reaction including the attempted army rising in 1932, the formation of CEDA to represent right-wing opinion resulting in a election success in November 1933, the counter-reforms introduced under Gil Robles and Franco's suppression of the miners' strike in Asturias. A simple descriptive outline of events 1931-36 will be marked in Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. At Level 3 will be those who begin to assess success of radical policies, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess success in both positive and negative terms, although at this level a balance is not required. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the success of republican policies in relation to the strength of conservative forces in 1936 within a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to integrate positive and negative factors into an overall judgement, perhaps suggesting that by 1936 the situation had reached stalemate with the creation of the Popular Front.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
8	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the Nationalist victory in the Spanish Civil War and requires an analysis of, and judgement about, the role of General Franco in achieving that victory. Answers may focus on Franco's ability to hold together various right-wing groups whilst remaining above factional politics, his leadership skills both politically and militarily, his earlier success against republican opposition, such as in the Asturias, and his ability to gain direct diplomatic and military support from fascist governments in Germany and Italy whilst maintaining diplomatic links to the democratic governments of Britain and France through the Non-Intervention Committee. A simple description of General Franco's contribution will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address the significance of General Franco, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material. Level 4 answers will focus on the role of General Franco in comparison to other factors, though at this level balance is not required. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate the relative significance of Franco in the overall victory when compared with other factors. Other factors may include the divisions and weaknesses within the republican forces, in particular, the in-fighting between the moderates, communists and anarchists, the role of direct foreign intervention including military assistance from Germany and Italy, the more volatile support for the republicans from the USSR and the non-interventionist policy of Britain, France and the USA. Answers may also challenge Franco's role by reference to criticisms of his military tactics and divisions amongst the Nationalists. Level 5 answers will address conflicting arguments within a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.</p>	30

E5 Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
9	<p>The question is focused on the reasons why Germany was partitioned in the years following World War II, and the extent to which the actions of the USA, Britain and France were responsible for the establishment of the two separate German states in 1949. Answers may refer to actions which effectively split Germany in two such as the announcement of the Truman Doctrine, the offer of Marshall Aid, the creation of 'Bizonia', the introduction of the Deutschmark, the response to the Berlin Blockade and the creation of NATO with the resulting counter-actions of the USSR in East Germany. A simple descriptive outline of some of these events will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will be based on relevance and range of accurate material. Those who offer some analysis linked to the activities of the western Allies and their resultant impact will access Level 3, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the role of the western Allies in comparison to other possible factors such as growing differences between the Allies at the end of World War II, increasing Soviet influence in eastern Europe, the development of the wider Cold War, Soviet actions in East Germany and the Berlin Blockade, though the answer may be unbalanced. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate directly whether the actions of the western Allies were the 'most important' reason within a broadly balanced response, while the best may integrate the different arguments into an overall judgement.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
10	<p>The question is focused on the extent to which relations between West and East Germany became less hostile in the 1960s and 1970s and requires the evaluation of the different factors contributing to the improvement in relations. Answers may refer to the move towards detente from 1963 between the USA and USSR after the crises of the early 1960s, the diversion of Cold War politics to areas such as Vietnam, the success of the Berlin Wall in stopping migration to West Germany, the economic and diplomatic need to end the Hallstein Doctrine, the election of Willy Brandt in 1969 and the policy of 'Ostpolitik'. Candidates may also choose to evaluate by challenging the suggestion that relations improved by highlighting areas or times of continued disagreement perhaps referring to the continuing problem of Berlin, human rights issues in East Germany and the re-emergence of Cold War politics at the end of the 1970s with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. A simple description of the improved relations perhaps with will be marked in Level 1 or 2, depending on the relevance and range of material offered. This may include references to the Basic Treaty of 1972, greater agreement over territorial borders and sporting links between the two states. Answers at Level 3 will begin to address extent with perhaps implicit reference to different aspects of the relationship, though there may be substantial passages of narrative or descriptive material. Level 4 answers will begin to evaluate with reference to the suggestion of 'great' improvement in relations. At Level 5 will be those who make some attempt to evaluate the suggestion by reference to the extent of improvement or to challenge the suggestion of continuous improving relations. The best responses may attempt to evaluate or integrate such reasoning into an overall judgement.</p>	30

E6 The Middle East, 1945-2001: The State of Israel and Arab Nationalism

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
11	<p>The question is focused on the reasons for the creation of an independent Israeli state in the years following World War II, and requires an analysis, and judgement about, the role of British policy in the emergence of Israel. Answers may refer to the nature of the British mandate in Palestine, the weakness of Britain post-1945, British policy to limit Jewish immigration, British attempts at compromise, perceptions of British bias from both Arabs and Jews, the invitation to the UN to find a solution, British refusal to operate partition and British withdrawal May 1948. A simple description of British actions will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will depend on relevance and range of accurate material. Answers which begin to provide an analysis of the British role in the emergence of Israel will access Level 3, though there may be some substantial sections of narrative material or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the role of British policy in comparison to other factors, though at this level balance is not necessary. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the relative significance of the British role compared to other factors. Other factors may include the inherent hostility between Arabs and Jews in Palestine and the unwillingness to compromise, the terrorist campaign against both Arabs and the British begun by Jewish militants, the role of the USA and the partition plan of the UN. Level 5 answers will address conflicting arguments within a broadly balanced response, while the best may attempt to evaluate or integrate them into an overall judgement.</p>	30

Question Number	Indicative content	Mark
12	<p>The question is focused on the significance of the Egyptian leader in Arab nationalism and the extent to which he was able to encourage Arab unity in the years 1954-70. Candidates may choose to evaluate by assessing the significance of Nasser as compared to other factors and/or by challenging the extent of Arab unity in these years. Answers may refer to the emergence of Nasser as leader of Egypt after 1954, the prestige Nasser gained in 1956 as a result of the Suez Crisis, the creation of the United Arab Republic, his role as President of the UAR & his actions in the Six Day War of 1967. Challenges to Nasser's significance may refer to other factors encouraging unity, such as hostility towards Israel, the concept of Pan-Arabism, the willingness of Syria and Iraq to co-operate with Egypt and Cold War politics or may question Arab unity as a concept during the period, perhaps referring to the ongoing distrust between Arab nations, the collapse of the UAR in 1961, growing resentment of Nasser's actions and the reasons for and consequences of the Six Day War. A simple description of the Nasser's actions in the Middle East will be marked within Levels 1 and 2, and progression will depend on relevance and range of accurate material. Answers which begin to provide an analysis of the role of Nasser will access Level 3, though there may be some substantial sections of narrative or descriptive material. At Level 4 there will be an explicit attempt to assess the role of Nasser in comparison to other factors, though balance is not required at this level. At Level 5 there will be some attempt to evaluate the relative significance of Nasser compared to other factors or the extent of Arab unity within a broadly balanced response. The best response may attempt to evaluate or integrate conflicting arguments into an overall judgement.</p>	30

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467
Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022877 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH