



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel GCSE

In History (1HIA/P5)

Paper P5: Period study

Option P5 Conflict in the Middle East, 1945-
95

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2022

Publications Code 1HIA_P5_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Question 1

Introduction to Question:

In question 1 students were asked to provide two valid consequences of Syria's support for Fatah in the years 1964-67. There are 4 marks available for each consequence. This implies a link between the stated event and the events or developments that are identified by the candidate. Most students understood the second-order of concept of consequence. Responses for question 1 covered the full-mark range. Many students showed good understanding supported with specific information, with most students able to access at least Level 1.

Introductory Commentary:

At level 2 students explained consequences resulting from Syria's support for Fatah such as Fatah being able to launch raids against Israel and Israeli retaliation. Many students were aware of the form the support for Fatah took. Better responses considered consequences both for Israel, or for Fatah, or for Jordan. Many students used the Samu Raid and the Six Day War well to support their answers. Surprisingly, Arafat was not mentioned a great deal, and there were some examples of mixing up Fatah and Arafat. There were a few examples of reversal of Israel and Egypt or who Fatah was attacking.

Conflict in the Middle East, 1945-95

Answer ALL questions. Write your answers in the spaces provided.

- 1 Explain two consequences of Syria's support for Fatah in the years 1964-67.

001

8

Consequence 1

One consequence of Syria's support for Fatah in the years 1964-67 was that ~~Israel~~ Israeli commander in chief threatened Syria that they could attack due to Syria's support for Fatah. Even though Israel corrected the commander for his claims, the Arab still took it seriously and prepared for war. This caused an increased tension and kept Syria on high alert. ~~and~~ Furthermore, this ultimately led to the six day war after a series of other triggers but Syria's support for Fatah ~~was~~ was the beginning of this chain reaction.

Consequence 2

Another consequence of Syria's support for Fatah in the years 1964-67 was ~~the~~ the empowerment of Fatah. Syria ~~was~~ ~~was~~ known to fund Fatah's operations and missions. ~~and~~ This allowed Fatah to conduct them more effectively with better and more weapons. Furthermore, they could risk a lot more in whilst attacking Israel as they knew they had Syria as backup. ~~lastly~~ This led to the ~~the~~ deterioration of Israel's security as Fatah would constantly launch guerrilla attacks on Israelis.

Both consequences are awarded high level 2. Consequence 1 reaches AO2 Level 2 with analysis of 'increased tension' and 'led to Six Day war'. For AO1 specific information for level 2 is shown with good knowledge and understanding of 'threatened Syria' and 'Syria on high alert'. Consequence 2 has AO2 at level 2 with explanation of the consequence, 'empowerment of Fatah'

which is supported with good knowledge in terms of 'more weapons' and 'guerrilla attacks', making the AO1 Level 2.

Examiner Tip:

Students occasionally offer two responses covering the same content for both consequences. Examiners can then only reward one of the responses. Students should therefore ensure that their two responses for Q1 cover different content. It is also important for students not to waste valuable examination time by writing far more than is required for the two Q1 responses.

Question 2

Introduction to question:

In Question 2 students were asked to write a narrative analysis on negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians in the years 1993-95. There were some very impressive analytical narrative responses for this question showing good knowledge and understanding of events. For the most part the format for a narrative account was provided with clear efforts to sequence events. For Level 3 students need to understand the narrative concept, with the sense of a beginning, development, and end, rather than produce three paragraphs which do not link. The two stimulus points serve as useful reminders to students of signposts along the narrative. Students do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge in the narrative being covered.

Introductory Commentary:

Responses awarded Level 3 showed a clear sequence of events, with linkage between them, about the negotiations in the years 1993-95. The responses tended to be in Level 3. Most responses used a narrative which included both the Oslo Accords, the role of the Norwegian leader, and specific terms of the accords. These narratives were then frequently supported with accurate and relevant information about the accords, the role of the PLO and better candidates putting it in the context of the post-Cold War period. Whilst Arafat was overall a recognised figure and students were able to expand upon his role, there were fewer candidates who were able to name Rabin. Those who did were often able to note the change of tone with his election and could also conclude with his assassination. Some students extended the material to outside the time frame asked, with references to Arafat's 'olive branch' speech, however better answers managed to use this effectively as a start point for a narrative. Level 2 responses often wrote about events but with only some analysis of the links between them or gave a narrative which was in part incoherent. Level 1 responses tended to be descriptive and there were numerous examples of confusion with negotiations in the 1970s. Often these were at the level of minor details, however, some candidates had mistaken the events fully.

2 Write a narrative account analysing the key developments in the negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians in the years 1993–95.

Q02

5

(8)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Arafat
- Oslo II (1995)

You **must** also use information of your own.

During the 1990s, Arafat conducted a speech to the United Nations which stated that he had a vision in one hand and an 'olive branch' in the other. This indicated that while his organisation may have attacked, they were open to peace talks and negotiations. In response, Arafat and Israel's leader decided to meet in Oslo to negotiate peace talks between the Palestinians and Israel. Arafat was seen as he was the leader of the PLO which the Palestinians recognised as their spokesman and leader too. Arafat and Israel's leader negotiated borders and what could benefit both sides to coexist. Consequently, this led to the finalisation of the Oslo accords. However, these peace talks followed up by another meeting between the two leaders in Oslo again, where they would solidify and strengthen their desires for peace in 1995. This ultimately led to the creation of the Oslo II accords.

This is an example of a Level 3 response. There is a clear narrative leading to an outcome, showing clear sequencing and analysis of linkage, such as 'agreed to negotiate' and 'left Arafat free' make the AO2 level 3. The knowledge is good of key features of period, such as 'two-state solution' and '20% of west bank' making the AO1 level 3. Overall, this response is the top of level 3.

Examiner Tip:

Students should make sure that they focus on the time frame given in the question and that links are made in their narrative account rather than writing a series of events with no linkage, and not treat the question as significance of the stimulus points.

Question 3:

Introduction to question:

Each of the Q3 options produced an even spread of choice. The first option on the territorial changes in the aftermath of the 1948-49 war most answers focused on the significance for the Palestinians. The Q3 on the PFLP airplane hijacks led to some high-level answers with some better AO2 than AO1. The Q3 option on the Yom Kippur War generated the widest range of responses. It was also noticeable during this examination session that far more students had widely differing marks for their two Q3 responses compared to previous examination series when students were often awarded the same or near similar marks for their two question 3 choices.

Introductory Commentary:

Q3.1

This option on the territorial changes in the aftermath of the 1948-49 war within Q3 was answered with many students able to maintain focus on the significance for the Palestinians and provide detailed supporting knowledge. Level 3 answers often explained conditions in the camps and citizenship was included in overall stronger answers. Many answers were well supported with AO1, being able to cite loss of territory and quote the figure of 700,000 refugees. The variety of possible ways to answer this question allowed for students to demonstrate memorable facts which helped with AO1, and meant those in Level 2, often were let down by analysis of importance for the Palestinians. There were some responses which talked about the impact on Israel instead. Some candidates wrote about the aftermath of WW2 and partition or talked about the war itself, not leaving themselves enough space or time to include the aftermath of the 1948-49 war.

Q3.2

This option on the PFLP airplane hijacks had a range of responses with good analytical answers relatively common. The variation of answer tended to be based around the different level of detail for support, with stronger answers offering more detailed AO1. Level 3 responses were well aware of differing international reactions to the hijacks and considered both positive and negative reactions. Stronger answers extended the impact to the reactions of Jordan, with King Hussein expelling the PLO. There were also several who linked the attacks to the Black September movement. Level 2 responses tended to have secure AO1 describing the details of the blowing up the planes and taking hostages yet focused more on the incident itself rather than the impact on international attitudes. In terms of AO2 students offered more basic statements regarding gaining or losing of sympathy for one side.

Q3.3

This option on the Yom Kippur War provided the widest range of responses. Level 3 responses frequently analytically explained the importance of the Yom Kippur War as a stimulus for changes in relations between Israel and Egypt. Level 3 answers would develop through the knowledge and understanding of the oil weapon and the involvement of the USA and leading to negotiations. There was a tendency to focus on details of the war, particularly around its timing of a holy day, but also on the battles. Better answers were able to relate these to the relationship between the two nations to some extent although the detail was frequently resulting in an overlooking of analysis in Level 2. There was a tendency in weaker answers to get confused with Egyptian leaders Nasser and Sadat.

Indicate your FIRST choice on this page.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

- The importance of territorial changes in the aftermath of the 1948–49 war for Palestinians.
- The importance of the PFLP airplane hijacks (1970) for international attitudes towards the Palestine issue.
- The importance of the Yom Kippur War (1973) for Israel's relations with Egypt.

In 1970, the PFLP hijacked ~~3~~ four airplanes and took 86 Jews hostage in return for PFLP prisoners held by various countries. The PFLP blew up the planes, expecting an attack, but released their prisoners in place of the hostages. This caused disapproval in international attitudes, as many believed that ~~the hijack~~ taking the Jews hostage was terrorism. The hijacks drew sympathy towards Israel and led to a catastrophe for ~~the PLO~~ ^{Fatah}. ~~Israel~~ King Hussein of Jordan ~~already had~~ ~~the~~ was reaching the extent of his patience for ~~the PLO's~~ ^{Fatah's} raids into Israel. He was worried that Israel would target Jordan in retaliation to the plane hijacks, so gathered his soldiers, ordering them to attack Karameh, Fatah's base in

Jordan. This led to civil war[↑] ^{in September, 1970} as Jordanian soldiers massacred many Fatah members, ~~chasing~~^{chasing} the organisation ~~out~~ out of the country. Fatah turned to Lebanon, also accepted hosting them in their country. However, ~~the~~ King Hussein's ~~expulsion~~ expulsion of the PLO was a disaster and caused many casualties, as a result of the PFLP plane hijacks of 1970. Many Palestinians called this month 'Black September'. It also gathered international sympathy for the PLO, and attracted ²⁰⁰⁰ ~~thousands of~~ Palestinian volunteers to join their military. Therefore, although the PFLP hijacks caused disapproval^{for the PFLP} and chaos for the PLO, it also later meant that more members joined the organisation, and gathered sympathy from the world.

Indicate your SECOND choice on this page.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

- The importance of territorial changes in the aftermath of the 1948-49 war for Palestinians.
- The importance of the PFLP airplane hijacks (1970) for international attitudes towards the Palestine issue.
- The importance of the Yom Kippur War (1973) for Israel's relations with Egypt.

The Yom Kippur War of 1973 was seen as a victory for the Arabs, even though they had lost. ~~Sadat~~ Anwar Sadat had fought, and nearly beaten Israel, alongside Syria. This caused a major blow to the confidence of Israel, as many believed that only US intervention had allowed them victory. The war made Israel realise that Sadat, who had at first seemed to lack charisma and ~~look~~ appeared to be a poor replacement for the previous president, Nasser, ~~and~~ had carefully coordinated an attack which nearly beat Israel. ~~It~~ This was shown in 1977, when David Begin of Israel was willing to discuss peace with Sadat, highlighting Israel's newfound respect for the Egyptian president. However, the war also damaged

relations between Israel and Egypt in 1973, ~~that~~ causing a dispute over the Suez Canal. Israel refused to move its troops away from the Canal, due to the recent conflict and because Sadat refused to allow Israeli ships to sell goods on the canal. As a result, until 1977, Egypt and Israel were in constant conflict after the Yom Kippur War of 1973, essentially damaging relations between them.

The first response on the PFLP is awarded the top of Level 3 as it covers the criteria for both AO2 and AO1 at Level 3. There is an explanation given, with analysis of importance, such as 'disapproving opinion in international attitudes' making the AO2 level 3. The AO1 is also level 3 with good knowledge of the period demonstrated such as 'Jews hostage' and 'attack Karamah'. The second response on the Yom Kippur War is awarded the top of Level 3. AO2 has explanation and line of reasoning, with 'seen as victory for Arabs' and 'constant conflict,' making it Level 3. In terms of AO1 the response shows good knowledge, such as 'Sadat' and 'Nasser' making it level 3.

Examiner Tip

Students should ensure that they keep to any timeframe given in the question and ensure that they focus their response on what difference the specified event/person/development etc made to how subsequent events unfolded.