

Examiners' Report  
January 2012

GCE History 6HI01 E

## Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from Pearson, the world's leading learning company. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our qualifications website at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com). For information about our BTEC qualifications, please call 0844 576 0026, or visit our website at [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk).

If you have any subject specific questions about this specification 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/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to the subject team at Pearson about Edexcel qualifications. Their contact details can be found on this link:

[www.edexcel.com/teachingservices](http://www.edexcel.com/teachingservices)

## ResultsPlus

### Get more from your exam results

#### ...and now your mock results too!

ResultsPlus is Edexcel's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam and mock performance, helping you to help them more effectively.

- See your students' scores for every exam question
- Spot topics, skills and types of question where they need to improve their learning
- Understand how your students' performance compares with Edexcel national averages
- Track progress against target grades and focus revision more effectively with NEW Mock Analysis

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://www.edexcel.com/resultsplus). To set up your ResultsPlus account, call 0844 576 0024

### Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

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 raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk) .

January 2012

Publications Code US030589

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2012

# Introduction

## Unit 6HI01 – General Comments

Candidates and their teachers are to be congratulated on the amount of knowledge shown and the serious application given to answering almost the entire range of questions across the six options. Legibility was generally good and very few scripts were difficult to read.

The standard of English and spelling is a perennial concern. Colloquialisms were commonplace and the use of abbreviations seems to be on the increase. Some abbreviations might be tolerated where they are in general use, such as MLK for Martin Luther King. However, to link MLK to JFK and LBJ, and to credit him with the passing of the CRA and the VRA, not to mention the success of the MBB, can be confusing and often obscures the point being made.

It is interesting to note that long narrative answers, which were once common, no longer appear very often. Fewer candidates reiterate the question at the beginning of their answers, and more are attempting to engage with the question from the outset. Some groups of candidates, however, appear to bring a learned response to the examination room, with a succession of scripts offering the same factors and the same supporting evidence. While this approach may produce an acceptable level of attainment, it can be a limiting tactic because candidates have difficulty in accessing a wider pool of evidence and ideas in order to show their own initiative and thinking; such answers find it difficult to meet the direct focus and explicit understanding required for Level 5 marks.

Answers at Level 5 require elements of sophistication in which candidates can provide analysis, inter-related links and judgements using evidence which reflects their own opinions and thoughts on the specific question asked.

Stated factor questions were generally approached with a discussion of the stated factor in the first paragraph and a consideration of other factors in the following paragraphs. However, some candidates were not able to play the factors confidently one against the other as the answer unfolded. Also a substantial number of answers applied a stated factor approach where none was needed or desirable. Question D9 asked 'How successful was Martin Luther King's campaign for civil rights in the years 1955-68?' There is no invitation in this question to consider other factors influencing civil rights, such as Malcolm X and Black Power, but many responses dealt only briefly with King's campaign as one of several, often irrelevant, factors.

A number of responses displayed an imbalance between content and analysis. Many of these were responses with a great deal of relevant content but with limited discussion of the effects or the significance of events, which thereby hindered the development of a detailed and focused analysis. Some perhaps considered the significance self-evident. For example, some responses on the Provisional Government (Question D5) contained much relevant detail about the continuation of the war, but then simply stated that this 'made them unpopular'. Lenin's slogan of 'Peace, Bread, Land' was apparently so popular it made the outcome of the October/November revolution a foregone conclusion. However, there are also an increasing number of responses which provide secure analysis, and often very good conclusions, but do not provide sufficient relevant and accurate factual supporting material to justify their argument.

Overall, however, there were few overtly weak responses, with most finding their home somewhere within Levels 3 and 4.

## Option E

Most candidates were well prepared for topics E1-E6 by their centres and examiners saw a full range of responses at all Levels. Most centres study topics covering Germany and Italy but there are an increasing number of centres opting to study Spain (E4). Most candidates have at least a reasonable knowledge of their chosen topics and show some understanding of the question asked, but many competent responses fail to attain Level 5 because of the lack of a direct approach to the specific question asked and/or the failure to select appropriate supporting material.

Addressing the focus of the question is a crucial factor in gaining success in this exam. Also, to reach the higher Levels, candidates need to create a reasoned argument throughout the essay not just produce a series of well supported assertions with a reasoned conclusion at the end. Once again chronological awareness and knowledge was at times lacking. Questions which require an explanation of change over time should show an awareness of the key dates and, perhaps even more importantly, the amount of time between key events and developments. However, despite these weaknesses, an encouraging number of candidates are at the very least attempting to engage with the question focus (Level 3) and there are very few candidates who just tell the story of what happened. The best responses show clear engagement with all aspects of the question asked and come to well-reasoned judgements in an articulate and interesting manner.

Please also refer to the Option F report for further exemplification responses.

### **E1 – The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815-70**

Both questions were popular and most candidates were well prepared with strong knowledge of the period. However, some candidates find the chronology of events somewhat confusing particularly in relation to the events between 1848-52 and 1859-61. There is also the perennial problem that a minority of candidates seem unaware of the death of Cavour in 1861 with references being made to his role as Prime Minister as late as 1870.

Q1. Most candidates were aware of Piedmont's contribution to the development of Italian unity during the period 1848-61.

Many were able to offer a decent analysis of the reasons for Piedmont's emergence and continued position in the move towards closer unity but seemed reluctant to prioritise their reasons in order to evaluate their significance and so reach the higher Levels. Some good responses were limited by the lack of coverage of the whole time period with some ignoring the emergence of Piedmont in the years 1848-52 and/or the developments after Villafranca. Some responses, while agreeing that Piedmont emerged as leading state in the 1850s, argued that Piedmont was more a driving force for Piedmontisation than Italian unity. However, there were a minority of candidates who interpreted the question with reference to the importance of Piedmont in the process of Italian unification in relation to other factors rather than discussing 'why Piedmont'? The best answers were able to distinguish the developments which allowed Piedmont first to becoming a leading state and then continue to influence events across the whole period coming to an overall or integrated judgement as to the reason why.

Q2. There were a variety of interesting approaches to this question. Some responses concentrated on the geographical unity of Italy using the events of the previous decade to determine the extent to which Italy had become united by 1870. Others accepted the virtually complete geographical unity but questioned other aspects of Italian unity such as political, economic, cultural unity etc. However, many of those giving this response failed to include even the briefest supporting evidence of the geographic unity resulting

in an imbalanced answer which only addressed the negatives to any extent. Also weaker responses made generalisations as to a lack of common identity or language which became assertion rather than explanation. The best answers suggested that despite the outward appearance and political institutions of a nation state Italy was still far from 'completely unified'.

Chosen Question Number:

- |                                     |             |                                     |             |                                     |             |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 3  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 6  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 9  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Question 12 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

(This page is for your first answer.) In this essay I will be analysing to what extent Italy can be seen as completely unified by 1870.

The first example of how the country was not completely unified by this time was the Pope of Rome and Venetia, both of which failed to be involved in a ~~was~~ united Italy in 1861. ~~Rome~~ Firstly Venetia was only joined through the 1866 Austro-Prussian war; where Italy joined forces with Prussia to defeat Austria. It was only through foreign assistance by Prussia <sup>that</sup> Italy was able to regain Venetia, and only through the defeat of the Italian army. In addition, Rome was only added through the Franco-Prussian war. Rome remained in the hands of the France until 1870, because they supported the ~~Rome~~ Catholic Church and the influence of the Pope. Again it was through

(This page is for your first answer.) Foreign assistance that Italy was able to gain Rome as the French were forced to leave and fight in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. It can therefore be said that ~~Italian~~ Italy was not a totally united state ~~because~~ ~~at~~ by this point because it was only through foreign intervention that Venetia and Rome joined, and ~~the~~ neither were included when Italy was proclaimed in 1861, and were only added through foreign diplomacy.

Another example of how Italy was not unified by 1870 is seen through, who led the country and in what form of government. <sup>it was by</sup> Piedmont led unification so the ~~government~~ government was formed from ~~just~~ Piedmontese nobility, ~~and~~ in addition voters were all male, literate and tax paying, making up a mere 2 per cent of the population; ~~the~~ and ~~governments~~ were mainly from the north so were not representative of the masses. ~~The~~ A parliamentary constitution was put in place, based on Charles Albert's Statute; not the republic Mazzini had dreamed of. The aims of this government were mainly political so were not suited to the south, where the problems were

(This page is for your first answer.) mainly social and economic. This led to great discontent amongst the southern population, as taxes continued to rise leaving peasants to suffer. This led to many leaving the hills to become bandits or joining the mafia. From this it is clear that Italy was not fully united by 1870, as the form of Government and those in charge were not suited in the South.

The Pope also played a huge role in preventing total unification. After Rome was added in after the Franco-Prussian war of 1870 he resided in the Vatican and called himself a 'prisoner'. He was hostile towards the new liberal state and said that any Catholics who supported it would be excommunicated. This put many Catholics in a difficult position and caused divisions to occur, where in the past the church had been a unifying party, it was now highly disruptive. This shows that Italy was not totally united because ~~the~~ Pope Pius IX put many Italians in a difficult position and caused divisions.

There was also a great divide between the north and the south due to the form of

(This page is for your first answer.) government Italy had taken and who was in charge. The king wanted to continue war so taxation continued to rise, meaning peasants struggled. Some moved to town for work, but found nothing so turned to crime. This influx of people in towns meant living and working conditions were very low. This led to revolutionary outbreaks among the masses. In addition, law and order broke down in Sicily and Naples, causing a revolution which turned to civil war, taking 4 years to suppress. ~~The~~ From this it seems clear that Italy was not totally united by 1870, and huge divisions still remained between the north and the south.

The reformation armed forces was also a problem. The armies of Piedmont, the Central States and Garibaldi's army of the South, along with other states were formed to a single force. This force was modernised, and ~~was~~ reorganised along Prussian lines, making it more powerful. However, although the armies of the country were ~~was~~ formed into a single force they were not ~~reformed~~ modernised until 1876, making them weak.



(This page is for your first answer.) against attack. This shows that although the armies were made stronger by 1870, the navies were not making Italy vulnerable to attack. This division means that Italy was not fully united by 1870.

In conclusion, I think that it has been made clear that there were still many problems with Italy by 1870, and these had to be overcome in order for it to be called a totally united state, which it had claimed to ~~be~~ be in 1861.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

This is a well focused response with a good understanding of the key issues and it uses secure supporting evidence. The emphasis is on the ways in which Italy was not completely unified and so the unifying factors present are more implicit than explicit leading to some imbalance. However, it clearly makes a judgement as to extent in the conclusion and covers a wide range of issues such as geography and political control as well as economic, social and military issues.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

Although long, detailed opening/introductory paragraphs are not necessary this response would have benefited from a short opening paragraph outlining the context of Italian unity in 1870. This would have established, in a succinct manner, the areas in which Italy could have been viewed as unified and would have given the counter-argument greater foundation.

## E2 – The Unification of Germany, 1848-90

Question 3 was by far the most popular with only a few candidates attempting a response on Bismarck's politics post-1871. However, there were more attempts than in previous papers covering this aspect and centres should note that Bismarck's policies from 1871 to 1890 are an integral part of the topic.

Q3. Most centres provide candidates with a solid understanding of the developments in the process of German unification. However, it is vital that candidates focus on the question set rather than write a general response as to the emergence of Prussia as a force for unification. The focus of the question here was the failure of Austria to maintain its dominant position rather than the reasons why Prussia became the dominant power. As a result many candidates with good knowledge wrote responses which were well focused and had some understanding of the key issues and which lacked well selected supporting material (Level 4) rather than responses which were directly focused with explicit understanding and well selected supporting material (Level 5). Most candidates focused on the strength of the Prussian military and economy in relation to the weakness of Austrian resources. Disappointingly few candidates focused on the decline of Austrian dominance itself with little discussion of the changing nature of power after the apparent re-emergence of Austrian power at Olmutz (1850) and the events leading to defeat in 1866. A significant number of candidates also seem confused as to the chronology of the developments of the Zollverein, making wide generalisations about Austria's failure to join and attempts to exploit its own trading area. The best responses were able to discuss the reasons why Austria was unable to maintain dominance over Germany in the years after 1848 with reference to the political, military, international and economic situation.

This is a typical example of a well focused response which clearly understands the key issues but lacks supporting evidence and a secure grasp of the chronology of events.

(This page is for your first answer.) In the years leading up to 1866, Austria's position changed from having dominance to becoming a weakness. Austria did face a financial 'decline' which worsened the situation, but there were also other factors which led to not only the weakness of Austria, but the isolation.

Austria's economic weaknesses resulted in financial crisis, as the country couldn't afford to maintain its general administration nor its army. They faced a problem, as Prussia was experiencing an 'economical boom' and could potentially swamp Prussia. Prussia had the geography, the raw materials and the willingness to become dominant which led to the downfall of Austria's position.

~~As the~~ when Hesse-Cassel ask Austria for support, this only back-fires. Austria could help to a certain extent, but did not have the perfect state of economy to be giving help. It was widely being seen that Prussia had the strength, and therefore Austria's influence was decreasing.

<sup>economic</sup> Another factor that explains Austria's failure to maintain the dominant position was the establishment and existence of the Zollverein. This was set up by Prussia, and encouraged trade, breaking down particularism between Prussia and the other German states, leaving Austria.

Linking on to this, the failure of the Erfurt Union only weakened Austria. Schwarzenberg's plan for the Grossdeutschland was not accepted

(This page is for your first answer.) by the smaller German states, and therefore the Kleindeutschland was taken, excluding Austria. Although Schwarzenberg was successful to a point in re-asserting Austria's influence, the other countries' opinions, and the state of the economy, held Austria back.

~~As the other hand, Austria also had~~ Austria also had industrial weakness, whereas Prussia was becoming increasingly 'modern'. Prussia was developing railways, and by 1864 they had 2000km, which was only resulting in a more booming economy. Austria lacked the 'entrepreneurs' that Prussia had, such as Siemens inventing the dynamo, and Krupp inventing the 'Krupp Gun'.

This links to Austria's military weakness. Austria was defeated in 1866 at the Battle of Sadava. This was mainly due to the strengths of the Prussian military such as 'iron Roon's reforms' making the army more efficient, and the general Moltke ~~whose~~ <sup>whose</sup> ~~valuable~~ training, expertise and skills in military were essential. The army of Austria lacked the planning, <sup>and</sup> the superiority of weapons, as Prussia had the 'Breech loading needle-gun' and accurate maps, as well as <sup>being</sup> well supplied by railway units and bakeries on the field. These weaknesses of Austria ~~also~~ explain its failure to maintain its dominant position.

(This page is for your first answer.) Austria also lacked foreign support, which again is what Prussia had before 1866. Bismarck had clearly gained the other states support by the Treaty of Prague, and had previously gained Italy's and France's support with the alliance of Italy, and meeting at Biarritz. This isolation of Austria resulted in it having no-one to turn, only leading to the failure in asserting its dominant position.

Finally, Austria was competing against a country which had a highly determined and successful leader; Bismarck. Bismarck himself said that it was his job to control the latter and steer the ship as best he could. This is exactly what Bismarck did, as he dominantly over-ruled the leadership of Austria. In the 1848 revolutions, Austria's leader fled, which it seems Austria never had a powerfully successful leader after this. This lack of leadership only gave ~~the~~ <sup>some</sup> reasons for ~~its~~ ~~was~~ not being able to maintain the dominant position.

The Economic weaknesses of Austria do explain the failure of Austria to maintain its dominant position to a reasonably large extent. If Austria's economy was strong, the army could have been built up, and able to defend itself in war better, as well as being able to have more of the other weaknesses Austria experienced, such as the lack of ~~lead~~ strong leadership, and the military weaknesses all contributed towards the failure of Austria to keep its dominant position.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

This is a well focused response that understands the key issues. It addresses Austria's economic and military weaknesses as well as its lack of leadership in relation to the growing power of Prussia. However, the supporting evidence is often generalised and lacking in specific details. There are good points made concerning the situation after the 1848 revolutions but these are undermined by a lack of secure knowledge and use of chronology.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always try to include 2-3 examples of factual knowledge to support the point/argument being made in each paragraph. If this response had included more developed paragraphs such as the one referring to Austria's military weaknesses then it would have achieved the higher Level marks.

Q4. Very few candidates attempted this question but those who did seemed better prepared than in previous exam sessions. There was a definite increase in the amount of accurate, detailed supporting material used to answer the question. The best answers were able to use evidence from the success of Bismarck's main policies against the 'enemies' of the German Empire, such as *Kulturkampf* and anti-socialism, to determine the extent to which a national identity was established. Other confident answers referred to the extent to which the Constitution created a national identity and to the establishment of/lack of 'national' symbols and institutions. However, a few candidates approached this as a multi-factor question attempting to establish other factors which encouraged greater national identity and often with reference to events before 1871 leading to some confused responses (Level 3).

The response that follows is a Level 3 response.

Chosen Question Number:

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 1  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 2  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 3  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 4  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 5  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 6  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 7  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 8  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 9  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 10 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 11 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Question 12 |

(This page is for your first answer.) Bismarck's policies in 1871-1890 were mainly based on the consolidation of the new German Reich and helping strength the national identity of the German people. Historians are constantly at debate whether this to to a full extent. After Germany was unified in 1871 his policies changed and he had formed an alliance with the National liberals.

This at the start of the new Reich is often referred to as Bismarck's 'liberal era'-but this alliance was done out of self-interest-the National liberals could help Bismarck achieve full national unity. This period of time saw Bismarck establishing a national identity through policy. This policy saw Bismarck start a series of reforms-one of these was the formation of a National German Bank

(This page is for your first answer.) and establishing unity through a more railways and a national postal and telegraph network. This led to a greater sense of National identity because the States were ~~was~~ now becoming interlinked - they were now more one Nation. Furthermore Bismarck had seen that all internal tariffs were abolished and as a result the German economy expanded; therefore Germany was becoming economically strong, and as a result the German people would be more proud and increasing national identity, due to the fact that they are a rich nation.

However National identity was mainly encouraged at the start of the Franco-Prussian war due to the central fact that they rallied behind Prussia to face an enemy of Germany. More over this National identity was achieved in the victory of the war as that was when Germany was unified - meaning Bismarck's policies played very ~~little~~ little - their main role was to keep the newly achieved National identity continuing.

(This page is for your first answer.) Moreover the Kulturkampf can be seen as a failure due to several key reasons - as a policy it oppressed the German people and ultimately drove them away from being proud of Germany.

The 'may laws impacted on not only German Catholics but German Protestants because they may laws affected the churches spheres of influence. Ultimately Bismarck's goal of ~~Great~~ putting himself at the head of a popular Protestant Crusade in Germany had failed and only made national identity ~~decrease~~ ~~and~~ in importance.

However in the end Bismarck repealed most of may laws and consolidated the catholic churches position in ~~the~~ Germany - a tactical move and had helped Bismarck win back support and therefore help restore some national pride and identity.

(This page is for your first answer.) Moreover the retreat from the Kulturkampf led him to his alliance with the Centre party and various other Conservative parties and started to pursue a more Conservative agenda - his aims to protect the interests of German business, agriculture and industry. This helped develop the sense of Nationalism identity because it was a goal of protecting the German economy and sustaining its strength, and therefore by maintaining German economic ~~Strength~~ strength - National identity could be greater.



However later policy over the Socialist drove down the importance of National identity; mainly because Bismarck had taken to oppressing the people again - his main aim was to crush Socialism. Even when he implemented State Socialism - The welfare measures were taken with some hostility because they believed the State was not really looking out for them.

(This page is for your first answer.) To an extent Bismarck's central policies tried to encourage national identity but it was not really trying to increase it. It was mainly done to secure unity between the new federal reich and so it was done more for the security of the new nation.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

The response attempts analysis and shows some understanding of both the focus of the question and the key issues. The candidate is clearly aware of the relevant policies and actions which need to be discussed but makes assertions rather than creating a developed argument. The conclusion raises some interesting points which suggests that with better deployment of knowledge this answer could have achieved at the higher Levels.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Always support arguments/statements with factual knowledge. In this case there are some perceptive comments in relation to Bismarck's policies which are not developed beyond assertions so limiting the response to Level 3. For example, there is reference to the growth of national identity during the Franco-Prussian War and Bismarck's aim to put himself at the head of a Protestant crusade but these are not supported with relevant factual material.

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

This is a very popular topic and once again it is encouraging that centres are clearly preparing their candidates to cover the whole time period and not just the rise and rule of Mussolini and the Fascists. As a result, although Q6 was the most popular question, Q5 was answered by a significant number of candidates. Increasing knowledge of the period from 1896 is very pleasing but too many candidates still seem to be of the opinion that in 1896, and even by 1903, Italy was a newly created state barely out of the Risorgimento when a quarter of a century had gone by since 1870 and almost forty years since the creation of the Kingdom of Italy. Also candidates often refer to the number of government administrations which had been in place since 1870 when referring to any stated period within the topic including 1896-1914, 1896-1922 and 1919-22, leading to wide generalisations and inaccuracies which undermine the security of knowledge in the whole answer.

Q5. This question was focused on the promotion of political stability in Italy in the years 1903-1914, allowing for candidates to discuss the attempts by the Liberal State to deal with the growing political divisions between liberals, socialists, Catholic politics and nationalists. However, many candidates concentrated more on general economic, geographic and social division which, although often relevant, led to answers which gave generalised responses rather than a specific focus on the political issues. As a result there were many answers in Level 3 and low Level 4 rather than in the higher bands. Also there was a general lack of chronological awareness of when different policies and actions took place within the time period leading to weak selection and application of supporting material. The best answers were able to suggest that despite attempts by Giolitti to introduce political and social reform, and to follow a more aggressive foreign policy that might prevent growing divisions in Italy, he was far from successful in healing divisions and in 1914 his administration collapsed with Italy divided over both future political developments and entry into World War One.

Q6. This question was the most popular and most candidates were able to discuss the role of force and intimidation in relation to other factors contributing to the consolidation of Fascist power. Many responses were limited to achieving Level 3-mid Level 4 by a lack of clear focus on the question asked and/or weak selection of appropriate and detailed supporting material. The time period stated, from 1922-1929, allowed candidates to encompass events from the March on Rome to the signing of the Lateran Treaties and to concentrate on the consolidation of power rather than the early rise of the Fascist party. However, many candidates focused on the development of Fascism pre-1922 and/or the failure of the Liberal State as well as events from 1922 while others included material about policies implemented in the 1930s leading to imbalanced answers. There were also many answers which either had a very weak grasp of the chronology and/or discussed factors in very general terms with little detail. There was also a tendency towards assertion rather than explanation and evaluation which meant few answers attempted a judgement or an integrated evaluation leading to Level 5 marks. The best answers often discussed the physical consolidation of political power, rather than generalised assertions about propaganda or popularity, with a discussion of the use of force and intimidation to take over political institutions in combination with 'legal' methods, the role of the elites and the Catholic Church and the genuine popularity of Fascist policies.

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

As stated in previous examination reports, it is pleasing to see the number of centres studying Spain. This topic has an often tortuous chronology and most candidates seem to have a good grasp of the development of events over time. However, a significant minority of candidates in this particular session found it difficult to place the election of the Popular Front government in 1936 leading to some confused answers for Question 7. The use of basic time lines are recommended as a way of ensuring that candidates develop a secure chronological knowledge of what was a fast changing period of history. Question 7 was by far the most popular question but it should be noted that the years of Francoism cover by the far the longest time period within the topic and as such should be addressed if candidates are to be able to have a choice of questions to answer.

Q7. Most candidates are well prepared for questions concerning the outbreak of the war. Many candidates were clearly aware of long term, short term and immediate/trigger causes of the outbreak of civil war. However, it is important that if candidates are going to use this as an analytical approach that they do not just start at the beginning with the long term causes thus creating a narrative commentary which does not engage with the given factor until it appears in the chronology. Many good responses failed to achieve the higher Levels because they spent so long explaining the long term causes, that by the time they had reached the consequences of the Popular Front election, time was running out and so the given factor was dealt with briefly rather than evaluated in relation to other causes. A significant number of candidates confused the Popular Front with the Provisional Government of 1931 and a few responses confused the civil war with the revolution of 1931. The best answers were able to put the consequences of the Popular Front election into the context of the long term divisions and fears within Spain and to relate this to the decision of the generals to carry out the attempted coup d'état which led to the civil war.

This is an example of a Level 3 response.

Chosen Question Number:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 4	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 5	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 6	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 7	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 8	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 9	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 10	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 11	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Question 12	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

The formation and the election of the Popular Front in 1936 is a key point and reason for the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War later that year. This is because the Popular Front was left-wing in ideology, where the groups on the right-wing were opposing its policies. However, many of the reasons as to why war broke out are long term and are underlying tensions within the years 1931-1936 (From the start of the second Republic to the point war broke out). In 1931,

The second Republic started, bringing hope to many peasants and working class people. The control of 67% of the land by only 2% of the population is a major social issue that shaped the Spanish landscape. The liberal republic had to modernise and so agrarian reforms started to bring the power away from the latifundistas (landowners). However, these changes weren't seen as quick or effective enough by the peasants, and too radical by the upper class. This

(This page is for your first answer.) with an innocent Italian man's death. This led to Mussolini's order for the Italian army to occupy ~~Corfu~~ ~~Corfu~~ ~~Corfu~~ Corfu, which therefore led to a demand by Mussolini for Fiume, which should have been given to Italy during the Versailles talks after the Great War but it wasn't. This is a very forceful, dynamic device to win the hearts of the Italian people as Fiume was a very topic of great anger for Italians.

Another device used for consolidating power is seen in the Matteotti crisis, where the politician Matteotti claimed he had evidence of corruption by the Fascists during the 1924 election. This led to his death as it would have destabilized Fascist power and have caused a great scandal. This is a key example of force and intimidation being used to consolidate power.

However, there are some events where Fascism didn't use violent methods to consolidate its power such as Mussolini's creation of the Grand Fascist Council. This forum was used by Mussolini to the point that many Parliamentary members stopped attending Parliament's sessions as their Prime Minister hadn't bothered to attend. This allowed Mussolini to pass a law on him becoming temporary Dictator without considerable

(This page is for your first answer.) resistance, this is a ~~war~~ rather unobvious example of the consolidation of power for Fascism without any violence being employed. Another example arose through the secret negotiations of the Lateran Accords which reconciled Church and State, again without the use of any violence. Also, with the radical change of the economy to syndicalism no violence was employed. ~~As~~ As this with many other Fascist policies which consolidated its power within Italy. In conclusion, Fascism only had to resort to violent measures at times where its legitimacy was called into question, or its initial gain of power or when it needed to show that it was strong. Most of the time it resorted to more subtle measures to consolidate its power such as through Parliament or by the ratification of treaties.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response attempts analysis and has an understanding of the focus of the question. The candidate is clearly aware of the long term causes of the civil war but the given factor - the election of the Popular Front in 1936 - is only briefly alluded to and discussion of the trigger event is confused.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

To achieve more than Level 3 the given factor must be developed and explained in relation to the question asked. In this case the significance of the election of the Popular Front government in 1936 was only very briefly asserted and not developed at all.

Q.8 Very few candidates chose to answer this question. Those who did were clearly aware of the general pattern of change over time with reference to Franco and the Nationalists' support of and from the Catholic Church during the Civil War and the consequent close relationship after 1939 combined with some misgivings about Franco's use of terror and the effects of tourism on the morals of the Spanish people. Some responses also mentioned the influence of Opus Dei on the technocrat revolution from the late 1950s onwards. However, few candidates seemed to be aware of the role of the Church officials in the criticism of the Franco regime towards the end of his rule. Some candidates also confused Spain with Italy referring to events more indicative of the relationship between Mussolini and the Catholic Church. Most responses tended towards narrative and/or assertion and consequently achieved Level 3-mid Level 4.

## **E5 – Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945-91**

Most centres prepare their candidates well for this topic and responses show a good knowledge of the topic with a clear understanding of the main themes. However, there were a significant minority of candidates with a weak chronological awareness of the changes over time and, in particular, who were confused over the time scale of events after the creation of the Berlin Wall. A number of candidates seemed to suggest that Mikhail Gorbachev came to power immediately after the death of Stalin.

Q9. Most candidates who attempted this question were aware of the significance of Willy Brandt and of the policy of *Ostpolitik*. Level 4 answers were able to explain the significance of Brandt in relation to other factors or to discuss the extent to which he was responsible but most failed to reach Level 5 because of either a failure to come to a judgement about his role or because of a weak grasp of chronology. Many responses suggested that he was Chancellor for the whole time period between 1969 and 1979 and few were aware of other developments in East-West relations or the actions of the East German government during the period leading to Level 3 descriptions/assertions of Brandt's role. The best answers suggested that although Brandt played a very significant role in relations he was able to do so because of the Cold War context at the time and that the economic situation in East Germany allowed his successors to continue to dominate the relationship in the latter part of the decade.

Q10. This was a popular question and most candidates were well versed in the general causes of the collapse of communism in East Germany. Some candidates focused on the collapse in relation to the longer term causes while others concentrated exclusively on the events of 1989. Either approach was considered appropriate to the question asked. However, both responses were often limited in attainment by a lack of knowledge and/or chronological security. Many responses were unsure of the actions of the Honecker government in response to both events in East Germany and the actions of Gorbachev, leading to weak discussion of the given factor. Also responses which looked at long term causes often referred exclusively to events which occurred in the 1950s and 1960s, or made wide generalisations about the economic differences between East and West Germany asserting that this caused the collapse, with little explanation. A few candidates appeared to believe that Solidarity emerged in Poland in 1989 and that Gorbachev was elected to power in the USSR. Some of the best answers suggested that the failure of the East German regime to respond to the changes spreading through eastern Europe combined with the influence of Gorbachev in the USSR meant that it was only a matter of time before communism collapsed.

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

This is a very wide ranging topic and centres are clearly concentrating more specifically on the bullet points and clarification in the specification leading to more focused answers from candidates. However, there are still a significant number of candidates who focus entirely on the Arab-Israeli conflicts or who do not read the time period stated in the question. It is vital for success in this paper that candidates answer the question and focus on the key words in the question set.

Q11. This was the most popular question. Candidates were clearly aware of the consequences of the Six Day War on Middle East politics and many responses were impressive in their detailed knowledge of the gains made by Israel and the effects on Palestinian politics. Some candidates were not able to then use this to discuss the effect on Middle East stability in the years 1967-79 focusing instead on its importance as part of the continuing Arab-Israeli conflicts or on its role in the events leading to the Yom Kippur War and so finishing in 1973. However, there were some very good answers which were able to discuss the role of the Six Day War in the wider context of Middle East instability with reference to the decline in Arab nationalism, the growth of militant Palestinian politics, terrorist activity, the Cold War, the oil crisis and the emergence of Islamist views. A few candidates suggested that, in spite of growing Middle East instability during this period, the consequences of the Six Day War subsequently led to some rapprochement between Israel and Egypt.

Q12. There were very few responses to this question. As in previous examinations with questions set on this period of the topic, candidates often lacked confidence in the use of supporting material and had a confused knowledge of the chronology of events. The time period stated allows candidates to discuss the reasons for the growth of Islamic fundamentalism between the Iranian Revolution and the September 2001 attacks in New York. Some good answers were able to discuss the impact of Western influence, continuing Palestinian issues, the consequences of the end of the Cold War, events in Afghanistan and the rise of Islamist politics. Centres are reminded that the indicative content section of the published mark scheme gives examples of supporting knowledge that might be used by candidates to answer questions.

There were very few responses to Q12 but this is a typical response to questions on the Middle East.

(This page is for your second answer.) The growth of Islamic fundamentalism ~~was~~ is <sup>radical</sup> the growth of beliefs that the Middle East ~~and~~ should return to a state as in Muhammed's day, favouring the Sharia law based on the Koran. This growth was partly due to the desire for removal of the Middle East, but due to the instability of this area caused by other factors, fundamentalism was spurred also.

The Ayatollah Khomeini resented any Western involvement as he saw it against their religious beliefs. These beliefs became very strong, and the USA got the name 'Greater Satan' as well as the USSR being 'Little Satan'. These anti-Western feelings most certainly resulted in a rise in fundamentalism, as people became more bitter in the hatred for the West.

~~In 1973, the oil embargo occurred~~ There is evidence for the rise of hatred for the USA and the West, as their support is resented, and the countries unite together to overcome the West. In 1973, the oil embargo showed this. When Saudi Arabia cut off the oil to America, the Netherlands and much of Europe, it was obvious to the world that the rise in fundamentalism was being fueled because of the desire to remove the West.

Furthermore, Saddam Hussein resented the West, particularly the USA. The USA was investigating the development of nuclear weapons by the IDF. Hussein resented this, and wanted the removal of the West. As Hussein ruled by terror and violence, such as the killings



(This page is for your second answer.) In Kuwait, he ~~also~~ raised violence, raising fundamentalism towards the West.

However, other factors also are responsible for this rise in fundamentalism. The religious ~~divide~~ divide between the Sunni and Shiite Muslims gave bitterness in people's hearts. In 1988 when the Baathists came to seize power, this brought fundamentalism. The Baathists gave wealth and improved education, hospitals and general living, which the Ayatollah Khomeini didn't agree with, as he wanted a return to the Sharia law. This led to ~~but~~ greater feelings, leading to <sup>a</sup> fundamentalist growth.

The Palestinian problem is largely responsible for this rise in fundamentalism. Over 700,000 ~~refugees~~ Palestinians were refugees and this only caused bitterness. The conditions of these camps were atrocious, only causing individuals to think that they alone had to change the Palestinian problem, resulting in fundamentalism. Groups such as the PFLP formed, and they caused griefs such as the ~~but~~ bombing of the Pan Am aircraft. As this led to the expelling of groups such as the PLO, it only led to an increase in the fundamentalism vacuum.

Linking with the bitter hatred due to the Palestinian problem, this led to more radical groups such as the 'Black September'. The killing of eleven athletes shocked the world, but these events were felt by the ~~most~~ a Palestinians as 'At least the

(This page is for your second answer.) word is noticing us now' and 'This violence was a last resort.' These fundamentalist groups were primarily caused by the sadness of these refugees, and the deep bitterness in peoples hearts.

Also, the massacre in Lebanon only created firmer fundamentalism. This led to the Hizbullah forming, which had radical views for the Israelis and the west. People wanted solutions, as their impatience was rising high. This is clearly shown in the Intifada and the 2nd Intifada.

Also, the failures of the 1990's peace process, such as the Camp David process, only gave way for more radicalism. People such as Bin Laden formed sheer hatred for the Israelis, and the West as some saw they were supporting this. This led to the formation of the Al-Qaeda, and has led to sorrowful events such as the 9/11 attack on World Trade Centre in 2001.

~~Also~~, It can be said that fundamentalism has been caused by the desire to remove the western influence, but there are other factors that have spurred fundamentalism as well. The utter desperation of Palestinians as they live in conditions 'burying one another' has only created radical views in peoples hearts for a Political Islam. Also, the religious differences, and fear for a growing Iran has spurred fundamentalism.

(This page is for your second answer.) views. Overall, ~~the~~ <sup>although it does play a large part</sup> ~~Process~~ I do not think  
The desire to remove Western influence was the main reason for  
fundamentalism, but the Palestinian problem <sup>and other factors</sup> has caused the vacuum  
of increasing fundamentalism.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This response clearly understands the question asked and has some understanding of the key issues in the rise of Islamic fundamentalism. There is relevant reference to the attitudes towards the West, the consequences of the Iranian revolution, Iraq, the Palestinian question and the failure of the peace process. However, there is also some insecurity as to the exact nature of Western interference and a general lack of awareness of events within the chronological time period of 1979-2001.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Events which happened before the time period of the question can be used to establish context or as part of a discussion of long term causes but it is important to make sure that the examples being used mainly refer to the time period being covered. Use timelines to help establish the chronology of events. Try to understand both the order in which events happened and also the time periods between events - periods of inactivity are often just as significant as periods of activity.

## Paper Summary

Centres might consider the following areas to help improve candidates' responses:

- a) Answer the question set – are candidates concentrating on the specific wording in the question and the dates covered?
- b) Chronological awareness and application – do candidates know the key dates and are they able to explain/expand points made with accurate reference to the order in which events happened?
- c) Supporting material – are candidates using sufficient relevant, specific and accurate material to support their analysis and, in particular, the conclusions to which they come?
- d) Reaching a judgement – is a relevant and analytical conclusion just placed at the end of a response which makes a series of developed assertions/explanations or does the conclusion reached reflect the argument made and sustained in the main body of the essay?

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

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

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email [publication.orders@edexcel.com](mailto:publication.orders@edexcel.com)

Order Code US030589 January 2012

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit

[www.edexcel.com/quals](http://www.edexcel.com/quals)

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual  
.....



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



Rewarding Learning