
HISTORY**9389/42**

Paper 4 Depth Study

May/June 2018**MARK SCHEME**Maximum Mark: 60

Published

This mark scheme is published as an aid to teachers and candidates, to indicate the requirements of the examination. It shows the basis on which Examiners were instructed to award marks. It does not indicate the details of the discussions that took place at an Examiners' meeting before marking began, which would have considered the acceptability of alternative answers.

Mark schemes should be read in conjunction with the question paper and the Principal Examiner Report for Teachers.

Cambridge International will not enter into discussions about these mark schemes.

Cambridge International is publishing the mark schemes for the May/June 2018 series for most Cambridge IGCSE™, Cambridge International A and AS Level and Cambridge Pre-U components, and some Cambridge O Level components.

IGCSE™ is a registered trademark.

This document consists of **18** printed pages.

PUBLISHED**Generic Marking Principles**

These general marking principles must be applied by all examiners when marking candidate answers. They should be applied alongside the specific content of the mark scheme or generic level descriptors for a question. Each question paper and mark scheme will also comply with these marking principles.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 1:

Marks must be awarded in line with:

- the specific content of the mark scheme or the generic level descriptors for the question
- the specific skills defined in the mark scheme or in the generic level descriptors for the question
- the standard of response required by a candidate as exemplified by the standardisation scripts.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 2:

Marks awarded are always **whole marks** (not half marks, or other fractions).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 3:

Marks must be awarded **positively**:

- marks are awarded for correct/valid answers, as defined in the mark scheme. However, credit is given for valid answers which go beyond the scope of the syllabus and mark scheme, referring to your Team Leader as appropriate
- marks are awarded when candidates clearly demonstrate what they know and can do
- marks are not deducted for errors
- marks are not deducted for omissions
- answers should only be judged on the quality of spelling, punctuation and grammar when these features are specifically assessed by the question as indicated by the mark scheme. The meaning, however, should be unambiguous.

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 4:

Rules must be applied consistently e.g. in situations where candidates have not followed instructions or in the application of generic level descriptors.

PUBLISHED**GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 5:**

Marks should be awarded using the full range of marks defined in the mark scheme for the question (use of the full mark range, however, may be limited according to the quality of the candidate responses seen).

GENERIC MARKING PRINCIPLE 6:

Marks awarded are based solely on the requirements as defined in the mark scheme. Marks should not be awarded with grade thresholds or grade descriptors in mind.

PUBLISHED

Question 1–12	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
Level 5	<p>Responses show a very good understanding of the question and contain a relevant, focused and balanced argument, fully supported by appropriate factual material and based on a consistently analytical approach.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses may be expected to be analytical, focused and balanced throughout. The candidate will be in full control of the argument and will reach a supported judgement in response to the question.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses might typically be analytical, consistent and balanced but the argument might not be fully convincing.</p>	25–30
Level 4	<p>Responses show a good understanding of the question and contain a relevant argument based on a largely analytical approach.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses are likely to be analytical, balanced and effectively supported. There may be some attempt to reach a judgement but this may be partial or unsupported.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain detailed and accurate factual material with some focused analysis but the argument is inconsistent or unbalanced.</p>	19–24
Level 3	<p>Responses show understanding of the question and contain appropriate factual material. The material may lack depth. Some analytical points may be made but these may not be highly developed or consistently supported.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses contain detailed and accurate factual material. However, attempts to argue relevantly are implicit or confined to introductions or conclusions. Alternatively, responses may offer an analytical approach which contains some supporting material.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses might offer narrative or description relating to the topic but are less likely to address the terms of the question.</p>	13–18

PUBLISHED

Question 1–12	Generic Levels of Response	Marks
Level 2	<p>Responses show some understanding of the demands of the question. They may be descriptive with few links to the question or may be analytical with limited relevant factual support.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses might contain relevant commentaries which lack adequate factual support. The responses may contain some unsupported assertions.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, responses are likely to contain some information which is relevant to the topic but may only offer partial coverage.</p>	7–12
Level 1	<p>Responses show limited understanding of the question. They may contain some description which is linked to the topic or only address part of the question.</p> <p>Towards the top of the level, responses show some awareness of relevant material but this may be presented as a list.</p> <p>Towards the lower end of the level, answers may provide a little relevant material but are likely to be characterised by irrelevance.</p>	1–6
Level 0	No relevant creditworthy content.	0

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
1	<p>‘Nothing but a brutal dictatorship.’ How far do you agree with this view of Lenin’s government from 1918 to 1924?</p> <p>What is looked for here is a reflection on the events in Russia during the years between 1918 and 1924, and the nature and extent of Lenin’s achievements in those years. Both the ‘brutal’ aspects of the question and ‘nothing’ can be debated. On the one hand, it could be argued that it was ‘brutal’ with examples being the purge of the Constituent Assembly, the creation of the Secret Police with Dzerzhinsky, Kronstadt, methods used against the Whites in the Civil War and the creation of the camps. The gulags re-opened, in many cases under the same management that had existed under the Tsar.</p> <p>It could also be argued that their opponents used similar methods, and what Dzerzhinsky did was simply a continuation of the methods used by the Okhrana. The extent of the dictatorship could also be debated, as Lenin genuinely was trying to move towards a socialist state and his means justified the end. Again, it could be argued that there were limited achievements which did little more than dismantle the autocratic and liberal regimes which preceded it, and the only lasting legacy was the dictatorship of Stalin, with all that entailed. On the other hand, a dreadful war was ended, as was the regime which had dragged Russia into war and had directly caused so many of the problems that Russia faced at the time. He did genuinely try to bring a degree of social justice to the Russian people. Given his inheritance in 1918, the fact that there was a working regime in place which had the support of quite a significant proportion of the Russian people is a lot more than ‘nothing’. There was recognition by other powers and the first trade deals. Many of the other nationalities were now slowly being integrated into the USSR and controlled by Moscow and the fear of fragmentation of the vast Tsarist empire had gone. The worst aspects of Brest-Litovsk had been overturned. There was substantial achievement there.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
2	<p>Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Mussolini as a national leader.</p> <p>Certain factors can be identified as ‘strengths’ and there is scope for flexibility in what is seen as a ‘strength’. Until the catastrophic error of going to war, he enjoyed a degree of support from the majority of the Italian people. He managed to develop a working relationship with the influential Catholic Church. Although authoritarian, he did not need to adopt the terror tactics of Hitler or Stalin. Exile and castor oil tended to be the punishments for dissidents. He at least attempted an economic strategy, with the Corporate State, to deal with some of Italy’s economic problems and the economic blizzard that hit, for example, Germany did not really happen in Italy. There was some economic progress and a degree of social calm. While backward in some respects when it came to the role of women, at least there were genuine attempts to improve the quality of education. A degree of political stability was given to Italy which it had not enjoyed, perhaps, since unification.</p> <p>It is perhaps easier to identify the weaknesses. There was a lot of propaganda and little substance. The Corporate State failed. The various ‘Battles’ often did more harm than good. His foreign policy, while having some merit with Locarno, was arguably highly damaging to Italian interests and motivated by a desire for personal prestige. Finally, he took Italy into a war which led to disaster for both himself and Italy.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
3	<p>‘Motivated more by ideology than by practical considerations.’ Discuss this view of Stalin’s economic policies.</p> <p>The focus of the response should be on the motivation behind Stalin’s economic policies. Some policies, normally seen as ‘social’ ones, such as investment in education and healthcare, and the employment of women, can be seen as ‘economic’ in this respect. Do not expect too narrow a definition here. A grasp of the Marxist (or Marxist/Leninist) ideology that Stalin maintained he followed is expected.</p> <p>There is a case for arguing that ideology did play a major role in his thinking. Collectivisation was certainly ‘Marxist’ in its approach, with state ownership of land being the dominant feature and then state direction of agriculture following. How much good sense there was there is arguable. The NEP had started to raise agricultural output to pre-1914 levels and the actual process of collectivisation led to famine, mass murder, the slaughter of livestock and meant that Russia was not able to feed itself. It also became exposed to the lunacies of Lysenko: hardly good sense in terms of outcome, whatever the intention was.</p> <p>Industry was state owned and directed by the state; in that respect it was ideologically driven. There was good sense seen in that there were serious threats from the ‘West’, as the Civil War had shown, and after 1933 there was a real danger obviously coming from Germany, which had to be counteracted. Russia needed to develop its heavy industry in order to survive. However, the methods used were often highly inefficient and the lack of incentives and consumer goods together with an appalling housing situation could be seen to be lacking in sense. The utilisation of women in the workforce made economic sense, but killing or sending millions to the camps did not. Slave labour was not the most productive method of raising productivity.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
4	<p>To what extent was Hitler ‘Master of the Third Reich’?</p> <p>Some reflecting/definition of what ‘Master of the Third Reich’ might imply needs to be part of the response. It is not quite the same as asking whether he was a dictator. On the one hand, he dominated policy making and opposition was limited or non-existent. He controlled the army, police and the judiciary. The SA became docile tools and the Party was totally subordinate. His gauleiters ran the localities.</p> <p>However, it was not until 1939 that he felt totally secure once Munich had seen him successful in Czechoslovakia as well as in Austria. He was genuinely worried that if the Anschluss failed he could lose his position. He knew that legitimacy was important and that his invitation by Hindenburg had been critical to his position and that the Enabling Act was passed ‘legally’ which gave him much of his power.</p> <p>However, propaganda and indoctrination were seen as necessary to develop his power. He took care to distance himself initially from the most violent attacks on Jews for fear of alienating both Germans as well as international opinion. He did a deal with the Catholic Church as he did not wish to alienate Catholic opinion in the south or in Austria. His economic policy took great care not to alienate German capitalists or capitalism; the focus there was very much on partnership. The army he treated with great caution as he well knew what their role had been in politics before 1914 and he had no wish to see that return. He was a clever enough politician to know there were, certainly in peace time, limits to what he could do.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
5	<p data-bbox="383 213 1868 280">How far was the prosperity of the USA in the fifteen years after the Second World War caused by American dominance of the world economy?</p> <p data-bbox="383 316 1868 347">Evidence that US dominance of the world economy from 1945 to 1960 explains its prosperity at that time includes:</p> <ul data-bbox="383 387 1890 555" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="383 387 1823 451">• The shortage of dollars in the late 1940s as exports outstripped imports with possible competitor states still recovering from WW2. Thus the USA normally had a balance of payments surplus. <li data-bbox="383 456 1608 488">• The provision of grants and loans, e.g. Marshall Aid, to help other states to buy US goods. <li data-bbox="383 493 1890 555">• The dollar's position as the reserve currency for international trade helped maintain US dominance and thus US trade. <p data-bbox="383 595 1514 627">Evidence that other factors explain US prosperity in the late 1940s and 1950s includes:</p> <ul data-bbox="383 667 1868 866" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="383 667 1868 730">• The balance of payments surplus disappeared by the late 1950s as other countries recovered from WW2, e.g. Japan and West Germany – and yet prosperity continued. <li data-bbox="383 735 1816 799">• The importance of domestic factors, especially demographic, with baby boomers' consumption stimulating growth. <li data-bbox="383 804 1805 866">• The economic policy of the federal administrations of the era, using public funds to stimulate prosperity, if unintentionally, e.g. the Korean War of Truman, the inter-state highway programme of Eisenhower. 	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
6	<p>How far was President Nixon personally responsible for his resignation as US President in 1974?</p> <p>Faced with the likelihood of impeachment [i.e. a political trial] removing him from office, making him the first president to suffer such a fate, Richard Nixon resigned in August 1974.</p> <p>Reasons why Nixon was himself responsible for his removal from office include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • His refusal to be open and honest with the US people about his involvement in the Watergate cover-up. • His abuse of ‘executive privilege’, special powers given to the president, in efforts to conceal his wrongdoings, e.g. by refusing to hand over tape recordings made of discussions he had had with key officials about Watergate. • His willingness to dismiss key White House officials, e.g. Ehrlichman and Haldeman, in an attempt to deflect criticism from himself. <p>On the other hand, Nixon was not solely responsible for his resignation. Other factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • US Congressional politicians had started impeachment proceedings against Nixon in 1973–74. Impeachment forced Nixon to act, to jump before he was pushed. • US journalists, especially Woodward and Bernstein of the <i>Washington Post</i>, who maintained the pressure on the President. • The judiciary, including the US Supreme Court, which ruled that Nixon must hand over the tape recordings he had made. • The Deputy Director of the FBI, Mark Felt, known at the time only as Deep Throat, who gave many key stories about the cover-up to Woodward and Bernstein. 	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
7	<p data-bbox="383 215 1547 247">How effectively did the US government respond to the AIDS epidemic of the 1980s?</p> <p data-bbox="383 284 1895 347">The first American deaths from AIDS occurred in 1981 among gay men living in California. By 1985 5000 people had died, by 1987 21 000, mostly gay men. Deaths from AIDS peaked in the early 1990s.</p> <p data-bbox="383 384 1865 448">Few would argue that the response of the federal government to AIDS/HIV was fully effective. Arguments focus on more vs. less effective.</p> <p data-bbox="383 485 1368 517">Arguments that the US government's response was very ineffective include:</p> <ul data-bbox="383 553 1895 798" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="383 553 1895 649">• The delay in its recognising and publicly supporting research to develop antidotes to AIDS until 1987. President Reagan did not publicly mention AIDS until 1985 – though some critics maintain it was another two years before he did so. <li data-bbox="383 655 1895 719">• The initial response of right-wing Republicans to AIDS; many saw it as just retribution for acts which at the time were illegal. <li data-bbox="383 726 1895 790">• The slow response of the Food and Drugs Administration [FDA] to undertake urgent research into the new mass killer. Only when pressurised by AIDS sufferers in 1987 did it show greater urgency. <p data-bbox="383 826 1368 858">Arguments that the federal government's response had some effect include:</p> <ul data-bbox="383 895 1895 1070" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="383 895 1682 927">• The federal AIDS budget was increased every year from 1982 onwards, often quite significantly. <li data-bbox="383 933 1895 997">• The FDA's slow response was a result of keeping to conventional research methods. When pressurised in 1987 by ACT-UP, it changed its methods and became more active. <li data-bbox="383 1003 1895 1070">• By the late 1980s, the government was undertaking a public awareness campaign, e.g. <i>Understanding AIDS</i>, a 1988 pamphlet mailed to every household. 	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
8	<p data-bbox="383 217 1507 248">Assess the reasons why US policies towards China in the 1950s were so hostile.</p> <p data-bbox="383 285 1895 349">The USA did not fully recognise the People’s Republic of China [Communist China or the PRC] until 1979, preferring to support the Republic of China [Nationalist China] on the island of Taiwan.</p> <p data-bbox="383 386 1211 418">Reasons why the USA was so hostile towards the PRC include:</p> <ul data-bbox="383 454 1895 799" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="383 454 1895 518">• The nature of the PRC under its leader Mao Zedong. It followed strongly anti-capitalist policies both within China and outside. <li data-bbox="383 523 1895 587">• The PRC’s involvement in the Korean War (1950–53), sending troops in to push UN – i.e. US-led – forces back to the 38th parallel. <li data-bbox="383 592 1895 655">• The US perception that the PRC was part of a united Communist bloc which threatened US interests and power in the Western Pacific region as well as in Europe. <li data-bbox="383 660 1895 724">• The sense that the Republic of China had been the USA’s special ally in the Western Pacific since 1911 – in contrast to Japan – made the PRC’s communist rhetoric harder to accept. <li data-bbox="383 729 1895 793">• The desire to split the Communist bloc. As relations with the USSR slowly thawed in the mid-1950s, so relations with the PRC had to remain frozen. 	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
9	<p>To what extent was the USA's defeat in the Vietnam War responsible for the development of détente in the 1970s?</p> <p>For the USA, détente was a way of coming to terms with the realisation that there were limits to its international power. Failure in the Vietnam War had clearly exposed these limits. In addition, it had led to high inflation, a massive budget deficit and a major decline in public support for American involvement in international issues.</p> <p>Moreover, Western Europe was also showing greater independence from the USA; France had gone so far as withdrawing from NATO in 1966. Faced with these realities, the USA decided that negotiation was a better option than confrontation. In particular, it would release funds for much needed domestic social reform and enable the USA to invest more resources into its economy, which was suffering from increasing rivalry from Western Europe.</p> <p>Fear of nuclear war was a key factor in encouraging détente. With technological advancements threatening to erode the delicate balance of power and the huge financial outlays required draining the economies of both the USA and the USSR, détente seemed more appealing. The USSR had achieved greater nuclear parity with the USA, and saw this as a good opportunity to negotiate from a position of strength.</p> <p>The USSR also needed to strengthen its hold over Eastern Europe following the Czech crisis of 1968 and strikes in Gdansk (Poland); recognition of the USSR's control over Eastern Europe was a clear aim of the USSR in seeking détente. The Sino-Soviet split was also a source of concern in the USSR, which wanted to ensure that the USA would not side with China. Détente would also allow the USSR to gain from trade with the West, helping to reduce the enormous problems facing its economy. In Europe, Willy Brandt of West Germany was encouraging better links between East and West Europe (Ostpolitik). Thus, there was a range of factors encouraging better relations which led to détente, of which the USA's defeat in the Vietnam War was only one.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
10	<p data-bbox="383 217 1435 248">How effective were the Helsinki Accords in improving East–West relations?</p> <p data-bbox="383 288 1883 488">The Helsinki Accords emerged from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (1973–75) with the aim of improving relations between the Communist bloc and the West. The agreements reached mark the high point of détente, with both sides prepared to make concessions. The agreement declared that the borders of European countries were ‘inviolable’ and could not be altered by force. This meant that the USA and all European countries finally accepted the existence of the Soviet Bloc in Eastern Europe, including East Germany. Brezhnev was able to claim that this was a significant achievement for the USSR.</p> <p data-bbox="383 523 1895 722">In exchange, the USSR made concessions demanded by the West, in particular an agreement to respect human rights, such as freedom of speech and freedom of movement across Europe. The West saw this as a significant step forward, since it would undermine the hold of oppressive Soviet regimes in Eastern Europe, especially since organisations were established to monitor its implementation. The West could claim that it had gained significant concessions from the USSR in exchange for simply accepting the reality of Soviet control over Eastern Europe. The Accords also encouraged trade between East and West, another factor in the improved relations between them.</p> <p data-bbox="383 758 1906 1066">In reality, the Helsinki Accords achieved very little. The West had simply admitted formal acceptance of a situation (Soviet control over Eastern Europe) which had emerged after WWII and about which they could do nothing anyway. In return, the USSR had made promises regarding human rights which would be very difficult to monitor and enforce. Moreover, the Accords did not have treaty status and, as such, were not binding on any of the signatories. President Ford responded to right-wing criticism of the Accords in the USA by stating that the USA was merely going along with European states’ acceptance of a fait accompli and committing itself to nothing. He added that it was worth doing this in order to extract human rights concessions from the USSR; if these proved to be worthless, the USA would have lost nothing in the attempt. From the start, therefore, it is clear that the USA had doubts regarding the USSR’s commitments regarding human rights.</p> <p data-bbox="383 1101 1906 1265">These doubts proved to be well founded. It did not take long before people in the USSR and other communist states were accusing their governments of failing to allow basic human rights. The USSR could not allow open criticism of governments in the Communist bloc for fear that this would encourage mass protests which would rapidly spread. The Accords, while symbolising the illusion of better East–West relations brought about by détente, actually achieved very little.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>‘The victory of the Chinese Communist Party in 1949 was caused by the unpopularity of the Kuomintang.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>The CCP victory was largely the result of weaknesses within the KMT. Chiang made little use of propaganda and made no real attempt to gain popular support for the KMT. Chiang’s government carried out very little social reform and clearly favoured the wealthier elements in Chinese society (landowners, businessmen, factory owners). Chiang believed that fighting against the Japanese invaders was a hopeless task and, instead, concentrated on fighting against the CCP which he believed posed the biggest threat to the KMT government. This added to the growing unpopularity of the KMT and led to divisions within his own armies (some of his troops even took him prisoner and forced him to restore cooperation with the CCP in order to fight the Japanese).</p> <p>The KMT government was widely seen as inefficient and corrupt; it was alleged that much of the aid received from the USA (which wanted the KMT to win the war because of its fear of communism) went into the pockets of KMT officials. In order to sustain its war against the CCP, the KMT printed more money, leading to inflation and hardship for peasants and middle classes alike. The KMT armies were poorly paid and poorly trained; unlike the CCP armies, they regularly looted the countryside. Faced with well-trained CCP troops, many KMT soldiers simply deserted or changed sides.</p> <p>Mao was an excellent exponent of the art of propaganda, using it effectively to gain popular support for the CCP. He had cultivated the support of the vast majority of the Chinese population, the peasants. Even during the traumas of the Long March, Mao had insisted that his followers show the utmost respect to peasants, while his land redistribution policies offered them hope for an end to poverty and famine. In the areas under CCP control, Mao continued to win popular support with his restrained land policy, which varied according to the needs of each particular area.</p> <p>He successfully portrayed the CCP as the true party of Chinese nationalism, in particular by fighting a guerrilla war against the Japanese. This gained him the support of the middle classes, who resented the threat which the Japanese posed to their livelihoods. As a result, the CCP continued to gain more territory in China; in 1937 the CCP had 5 bases controlling 12 million people; by 1945, it controlled 100 million people from 19 bases.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
11	<p>CCP forces gained a reputation for good discipline, while the CCP was increasingly perceived as both honest and fair. Mao ensured that the CCP armies were well trained and well led. He appointed generals who were tactically competent and utterly loyal to the cause (e.g. Lin Biao, Ch-en Yi, Chu Teh). Although the USA helped the KMT gain control of land previously occupied by the Japanese, the CCP was able to gain control of Manchuria (where the USSR obstructed the KMT). This gave the CCP a major base from which to continue its guerrilla war against the KMT. By 1949, the CCP had gained sufficient strength to challenge the KMT directly, taking Beijing and forcing Chiang to flee to the island of Taiwan.</p>	
12	<p>‘Israel’s involvement in the Suez War ended in failure.’ How far do you agree?</p> <p>The Suez War of 1956 resulted from a combined British, French and Israeli plan to attack Egypt, regain Anglo-French control of the Suez Canal and remove Nasser from power in Egypt. Israel’s motives for involvement were clear – Nasser was aggressively in favour of Arab unity and strongly in favour of the liberation of Palestine from Israeli control; therefore, he posed a significant threat to Israel’s existence. Moreover, involvement in the war might potentially enable Israel to take more territory. The plan began well, the Israeli invasion proving a brilliant success. Within a few days, Israeli troops had taken the entire Sinai peninsula, while British and French troops had taken control of the northern end of the Suez Canal.</p> <p>However, the attack led to an international outcry – the USA, which had hinted support for the attack because of its own fears that Nasser was becoming too influenced by the USSR, condemned the attack. At the UN, the USSR and USA both called for an immediate ceasefire. With the UN threatening to send its own forces to prevent further warfare, Britain, France and Israel had little option but to withdraw. Israel was forced to hand back all the territory it had taken from Egypt, and a UN peacekeeping force moved in to police the border between Egypt and Israel. The war was hailed as a triumph for Nasser, who remained in power with heightened credibility amongst the Arabs. Israel therefore did not achieve its aims in the Suez War, and merely attracted international condemnation for its part in it.</p> <p>Israel had not achieved its main aims; Nasser remained in control of Egypt and Israel had been forced to withdraw from all the territory it had taken. However, whereas Britain and France had been humiliated and had their diplomatic weaknesses exposed, Israel could justifiably claim some success from its involvement in the Suez War. Serious weaknesses had been exposed in Egypt’s armed forces. Israeli troops had inflicted heavy losses on Egypt’s military capability, in terms of both men and equipment.</p> <p>As a result, Egypt would be in no position to threaten war against Israel for some considerable time. This would allow Israel time to consolidate its position in the Middle East and continue to develop its own military capability. Moreover, Israel was less threatened by raids organised by groups such as the Fedayeen.</p>	30

PUBLISHED

Question	Answer	Marks
12	With Britain now weak, Israel formed closer relationships with the USA, itself concerned by the threat posed to its influence in the Middle East by Soviet support for Arab states. This provided Israel with crucial diplomatic backing at the UN as well as access to the modern weaponry which was to prove vital in future encounters.	