

Examiners' Report
June 2015

GCE History 6HI01 E

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2015

Publications Code US041760

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

Introduction

General Comments

The June 2015 examination session produced a wide variety of responses but overall the majority of candidates were able to produce organised responses with at least some sound analysis and relevant supporting material. Most candidates produced responses within Levels 3-5 and there were far fewer candidates this session who misunderstood questions or who provided responses with predominantly irrelevant material. Examiners commented particularly on the quality of argument in many of the L5 responses. Centres and their candidates are to be commended on the hard work and effort that clearly goes into the preparation for the 6HI01 examination.

Some obstacles to achieving higher Level marks, however, are still apparent in responses. While many candidates understood the importance of addressing the entire chronological period in the question, others either did not address the time period adequately or used a time period different from the question set with which they apparently felt more comfortable. For example, D9 covered the years 1945-56, but a significant number of responses included Little Rock, Greensboro and the Freedom Rides, while many responses to F14 referred to the years 1933-39 rather than the war years of 1939-45. Candidates should be aware that the timescales set may be different from those in previous examination sessions and that they should base their responses on the exact date period used on the examination paper rather than those previously encountered in practice questions.

Some candidates chose questions whose stated factor appeared to be outside their comfort zone, and delivered an answer which was only obliquely linked, if at all, to the question. A14 asked about the extent to which Henry VII's domestic policies strengthened royal power in England. Some candidates, perhaps hoping for a different question, wrote largely or even exclusively on foreign policy. Many answers to C6 included material more appropriate to the abolition of the slave trade in 1807 rather than the abolition of slavery in 1833, while some responses to C11 were focused on British expansion in Africa as a whole rather than Egypt and the Nile Valley.

Questions which have a multi-factored focus are signposted by phrases such as 'most important'. Some of the most confident answers to these questions had an introduction, which either agreed with the role of the stated factor or proposed one or more alternatives. Many questions, of course, do not require the consideration of several factors. D9, for example, asked for a consideration of the extent to which the NAACP changed the status of African Americans in the years 1945-56. Many strong answers noted the Association's success in achieving de jure victories via the Supreme Court, but that these were not always accompanied by de facto success thanks to the opposition of Congress or of groups such as the White Citizens Councils. A number of candidates addressed the NAACP's successes, but went on to address other ways in which the status of African Americans was changed, referring to the impact of World War II and to the work of President Truman: these points were not relevant to the question set.

An integral part of the mark scheme is the quality of written communication displayed in an answer. This year there was an improvement in candidates' communication skills, with much less use of abbreviations and colloquialisms. However, the quality of handwriting on a small number of scripts weakened communication overall. Able candidates wrote articulately and coherently, demonstrating a logical mind as well as strong linguistic skills. Weaker answers were characterised by poor sentence construction and writing skills. This was a limiting factor in some answers where candidates clearly knew their history, but struggled to produce a coherent and readable response.

Please note: 6HI01 is standardised across the Option papers and so it is recommended that Centres read the reports for all of the Options as comments made generally apply to all papers. In the case of Option E and F, where there are identical questions, this is particularly the case.

The Expansion and Challenge of Nationalism

Over 2,500 candidates sat the Option E paper this summer. As usual most candidates were well prepared and many were able to select and deploy relevant supporting material to great effect in answering their chosen questions. In the higher Levels, examiners noted some outstanding answers commenting both on the quality of the responses and how engaging many of the responses were. In particular, reference was made to responses to questions E1, E2, E8 and E12. At the lower Levels, however, there more responses than in previous years which showed some understanding expressed in simple developed statements (L2) rather than attempted analysis (L3).

Question 1

The Road to Unification: Italy, c1815–70

This is a popular topic and as usual candidates were generally well prepared and were usually able to deploy a range of factors/issues for discussion. Differentiation between and within Levels was usually seen in the selection and use of appropriate supporting detail. Candidates were clearly able to answer both questions with confidence.

Question 1

There were some good answers here and many candidates were able to consider the role of Austrian opposition by addressing its limitations and /or other factors, particularly the lack of unity/popular support/international support which put them well into L4. Well prepared candidates were able to discuss Austrian opposition at various stages across the time period. Less successful candidates often wrote generalised answers with few examples to support their statements or were confused as to the chronology of the various revolutionary events. Some candidates concentrated on the 1848-49 revolutions leading to imbalanced answers and a small minority crossed the time period into the 1850s/60s.

A Level 5 response from the Unification of Italy topic.

Put a cross in the box indicating the FIRST question you have chosen to answer .
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

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

(This page is for your first answer.)

Plan

Strength
Deterrent (Ferrara)
Intimidate
Regruise

localised
↗ 2%
↘ lack of co-op
Different aims

lack of popular support
Castonari (Sicily)
Piedmont - Sardinia
Roman Republic

Lack of foreign
Troppau
Louis phillipe
France

After the Congress of Vienna in 1815, Napoleonic Italy was returned into a fragmented peninsula, however after a taste of unification many Italians throughout 1815 to 1849 were involved in insurrections striving for national unification. Despite the many revolutionary efforts little progress was made towards Italian unity and this was due to various interdependent factors obstructing unity. Such as, the intervention of Austria, a lack of popular support, an absence of foreign support and the localised nature of the uprisings. However, in terms of relative significance the strength of Austria is undoubtedly paramount.

The strength and intervention of Austria resulted in the lack of progress towards unity because it acted as a deterrent to any nationalist ideals. This was most evident in the armed Austrian garrison held in Ferrara from 1815 to 1846. This garrison prevented the development of a mass revolution and quickly ended the revolutionary attempt made in Bologna, 1831. Furthermore, the strength of Austria resulted in a lack of Italian progress because it physically crushed all revolutionary forces. This is evident in the fact that 3 out of the 6 revolutions in Italy between 1820 and 1831 were destroyed by Austrian forces. This meant that revolutionaries could not make progress.

(This page is for your first answer.)

to unity. Lastly, Austrian intervention also intimidated revolutionaries on an individual level, for example Duke Francesco IV who reported and arrested the leaders of the 1831 Modenese revolution - simply because he feared Austria. Therefore causing revolutionary failure. The effect of Austria caused the revolutions failure on a ^{local} level, this is possibly due to the lack of local popular support.

The lack of popular support resulted in the failure of Italian ~~revolution~~ progress to unity because it made revolutionary forces weaker and therefore easier to crush. For example, the Neapolitan revolution in 1820 was ~~made~~ consisted of 30 carbonari and 100 soldiers lead by general Guglielmo Pepe. This meant that the Austrians could overthrow the revolution with ease. ~~For~~ Moreover, the lack of popular support affected Italian revolutionary military power in Piedmont-Sardinia, 1848 where Charles Albert refused to incorporate masses into his personal revolution against Austria ~~and~~ which resulted in his defeat before the end of 1849. This lack of popular support ~~was~~ limited progress towards unity because it made the Italians weak. Lastly, the destruction of the Roman Republic is further example of a lack of popular support from the masses allowing revolutionaries - the triumvirate to be destroyed, in this case by France. ^{however,} The lack of popular support was only

(This page is for your first answer.)

made significant by the overwhelming force of Austria which destroyed revolutionaries. ~~to Austria~~, a foreign intervention on behalf of Italy would have combated Austria.

The lack of international allies was caused by the Troppau Protocol of 1820 which ~~also~~ permitted Great Powers to militarily intervene in any European attempts at revolution. ~~This was~~ The Troppau Protocol resulted in the lack of foreign intervention which forced Italian revolutionaries to try to sustain themselves which was impossible with their lack of strength. This is evident in Louis Phillip's - Policy of non-intervention regarding the revolution in Modena in 1831. Italian revolutionaries ~~where met~~ were unable to sustain their revolution due to a lack of foreign support which was caused by the Troppau Protocol and therefore were unable to make significant progress towards unification. However, in terms of relative importance Austria supersedes lack of international support because similar to a lack of domestic support it was the fear of Austria which alienated Italy. Not only was Italy isolated internationally but also regionally this resulted ~~in~~ in the revolutions being limited by localised nature.

The localised nature of the progress towards unity was embedded in the fact only ~~20~~ 2% of the peninsula

(This page is for your first answer.) spoke what is recognised as Italian. ~~#~~

This prevented a cohesive progress towards unity being made across the entire nation, therefore preventing Italian unity. In addition, the progress towards unity was obstructed by the difference in aims amongst the regional revolutions. For example, in 1820, Naples wanted to end the repressive regime of the Bourbon King whereas Sicily wanted to separate from the mainland.

Or ~~the~~ 1831 Modena which campaigned for 'revolutionary radicalism' but Bologna desired 'revolutionary liberalism'.

The difference in aims fostered an inability for revolutions to cooperate and therefore caused a lack in progress towards Italian unity. One could argue that even if regions overcame their difference they would still not match the strength of Austria because this was proven throughout ~~1831~~ 1821 because the Austrian army simultaneously crushed the revolutions in Naples, Sicily and ~~the~~ Piedmont.

Conclusively, the strength of Austria was clearly the most significant barrier to Italian unification between ~~1820~~ 1815 and 1846. This because it was in 1815 that Austria split the nation of Italy into fragmented regions and ~~is~~ repealed any hope of unity through the abolishment of the Napoleonic. The strength of Austria was also the root cause in a lack of popular

(This page is for your first answer.) support because it was through Austrian ferocity that Italians such as Duke Francesco II did not take up arms to fight for unity. Similarly, the lack of foreign aid can be attributed to the Austrian prince Metternich who instilled the Trochu Protocol which prevented any hope of foreign aid for the aims of Italian unity. Lastly, the Austria's overwhelming military strength in 1820 it has been proven that if the entirety of the Italian peninsula had fought Austria, Austria would be found triumphant.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response directly focused on the question with an explicit understanding of the key issues and well selected supporting material from across the timescale. It discusses the given factor from the question in relation to other factors while sustaining a clear argument.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Higher level responses to a multi-factor question address the given factor in some detail and then link it to other factors in order to establish relative importance. You can see that in each paragraph here the strength of Austrian opposition is addressed in relation to the other factors being discussed. This allows for a sustained argument to be created.

Question 2

This was the more popular question. At the higher Levels candidates usually considered the economic, social and cultural advantages of Piedmont in addition to the role of various 'Piedmontese' individuals and in relation to a variety of other factors including the role of Garibaldi, Louis Napoleon/France and Prussia. Those candidates who developed the given factor of Piedmont almost wholly with regard to the role of Cavour, however, often produced imbalanced answers which failed to cover the whole time period. Many candidates were able to offer nuanced evidence, analysing motives and ideology which thus prevented description and narrative. These candidates were able to evaluate and integrate different factors suggesting, for example, that if Garibaldi had not acted, unification would have been less likely from Piedmont.

Question 3

The Unification of Germany, 1848–90

As with the Unification of Italy this is a popular topic for which candidates are generally well prepared. E3 was much more popular than E4 and, as with Italian Unification, differentiation between and within Levels was mainly as a result of the quality of the selection and deployment of supporting evidence.

The use of the Zollverein as the given factor led to a wide variability in the quality of responses. Most candidates had a sound understanding of the Zollverein as well as its contribution to further economic and military developments, but some responses failed to show a clear definition of the Zollverein and so were unable to link it adequately to wider Prussian developments. Where candidates started with the rivalry between Austria and Prussia they were able to keep the focus on Prussian domination rather than German unification and the role of Bismarck. Indeed, there were very few candidates who saw this purely as a German unification question.

Question 4

This question produced a range of responses, some more focussed than others. Candidates who focussed on the extent to which Germany was unified rather than the stages of unification, produced some excellent answers. At the higher Levels candidates drew out the difference between Prussian domination and genuine German unity. On the other hand, some responses remained in L3 by offering description of the stages of unification, with Bismarck centre stage. Some of the higher Level responses were able to discuss the short-term impact of the structure of the newly created German Empire on the extent of unification, but some candidates went on to discuss Bismarck's policies after 1871.

Question 5

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

Italy 1896-1943 is the most popular topic within Option E. Most candidates are well prepared, and it has been a real pleasure to see an improvement in candidate knowledge and understanding of the pre-1922 period over the course of the qualification. The majority of candidates are also well versed in the rise and consolidation of Mussolini's power to 1925, but many candidates still struggle to discuss effectively change over time, outside of foreign policy, between 1925 and 1943.

This was a popular question (a clear indication of the growing confidence of candidates in approaching the pre-1922 period), but a significant number of candidates were confused between extent and cause with the result that many candidates outlined the divisions rather than discussing extent. Most candidates were aware of the North-South divide and the impact of foreign policy on political divisions i.e. the response of the Nationalists and Socialists. However, at the lower Levels there was too much descriptive material offered on the North-South divide, which prevented responses from dealing with change. A surprising, and indeed disappointing, number of responses focused on the pre-World War 1 period with little discussion of the growing divisions and events at the end of the specified period. Many candidates commented on Mussolini bringing 'unity' in 1922 with little consideration of the divisions which had brought about the rise of fascism itself. Candidates who shaped their responses around eras of change, for example, Giolitti's changes, impact of WW1 etc, tended to produce better responses. Overall, however, few candidates offered really robust evidence on the divisions caused by the failures of the Liberal State or issues relating to the whole of the date range.

This is a L4 response to the Italy 1896-1943 - Liberal State and Mussolini topic.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
 Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
 If you change your mind, put a line through the box
 and then put a cross in another box .

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.)

political (1)
 • unification
 • trasformismo - Adona
 • Giolitti

political (H)
 • Giolitti
 • Socialism 27000
 • Cash ~ 200,000
 ~ 04/09

econ (2) - 1898
 • bad harvests - Milan
 • tariffs
 • NIS - Gio
 • agr

econ
 • N/S divide (3)
 • agr
 (WWI)

(This page is for your second answer.)

During the years 1896-22, political and economic divisions increased in Italy to a large extent. Political divisions were that people were ~~begin~~ beginning to realise the failures of liberal Italy, resulting in the growth of Socialism and Fascism. Economic divisions increased due to the First World War and ^{largely} due to the bad harvests Italy experienced around 1900.

Firstly, political divisions increased due to the failures of the liberal state. This meant that politically was unstable due to the lack of mass support ~~in~~ of people who were involved in the process of unification. Another reason why Italy was economically unstable was due to the fact that they had 29 prime ministers between 1870-1922. This instability is ~~also~~ highlighted by the weaknesses of Trasformismo. ~~The~~ The nature of Trasformismo meant that politicians ~~increased~~ formed factions and put aside their differences and only stressed on similarities. As a result, the political system were unable to help to economic and political problems within Italy, ~~causing~~ causing these divisions to increase. Furthermore, this was not helped when Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1895 and were humiliated at the Battle of Adowa. This left Italy weak politically and economically since they were

(This page is for your second answer.) in 1000 m lire of debt and were unable to form a colony in Africa. Even though Giolitti tried to rectify these weaknesses when he was appointed as prime minister in 1903; however he was unable to effectively 'absorb' Catholicism and Socialism together. This is because the North South divide was still evident and the concept nature of *Trasformismo*, meant that still Italy were economically and politically compared to other European great powers, such as Britain and France.

~~Despite Giolitti introducing various reforms between 1903, 1913, for instance increasing the national wage by 25%,~~

Not only were the political problems of Liberal Italy becoming more evident, but also the economic ones. The government had high tariffs, meaning that imports were very expensive, resulting to a decline in the standard of living. Furthermore, there were bad harvests throughout the 1890s. This is significant because in 1913, over 57% of the population worked on agriculture, meaning that these bad harvests left people economically

(This page is for your second answer.) divided. This is evident when there were riots in Milan in 1898, which resulted in 200 people being killed by troops. This demonstrates that ~~since Italy was~~ economically the ~~an~~ economic weaknesses highlight the political weaknesses, since the government had to call in the army in order to restore a peace. Additionally, even though Giolitti was able to increase the national wage by 25% between 1904-1915, the North South divide had never been more evident. For example, in 1914, 0.01% of the population ~~owned~~ owned 90% of Southern land - highlighting the inequalities within Italy. Furthermore, Giolitti was able to decrease the illiteracy rate from ~~89~~ 47% to 35% in North, but it ~~still~~ remained undoubtably high in the South at 68%.

These economic weaknesses are also demonstrated after Italy joined the First World War in 1915. The post-war ~~dis~~ disillusionment was incredibly high, leaving Italy economically and politically divided. Firstly, the national debt increased from 16 billion lire to 85 billion lire in 1919. This impacted

(This page is for your second answer.) on unemployment, which peaked at 2 million in 1919. Furthermore, this is also highlighted at the 1917 bread riots, showing that ~~the~~ the first world war caused massive divisions, even before it had ended. Spiralling inflation (purchasing power fell by 25%), ~~meaning~~ ^{meaning} that the middle class were massively effected since this destroyed their savings. As a result, ~~these economic divisions~~ resulted in further political divisions, for instance the rise of socialism. The devastating effects of World War One left Italy economically in a mess. ~~highlighting~~ highlighting the failures of *Trasformismo*.

The ~~polit~~ ~~an~~ economic divisions, resulted in further political divisions, for instance the rise in socialism. The Socialists were able to receive 32.4% of the National vote in the 1919 elections, where they ~~received~~ ~~at~~ managed to gain 156 seats in Parliament. This demonstrates the political divisions massively because liberalism was

(This page is for your second answer.) Declining and the King and elites wanted to turn to another type of political system, instead of Socialism. Therefore, Mussolini was able to ~~gain~~ ~~PTT~~ become noticed by the elites due to the activities of the Squads, ~~where~~ and these activities were ~~also~~ first decided at in March 1919 at the Fasci di Combattimento meeting.

To conclude, it is clear that between 1896-1922, Italy ~~was~~ ~~never~~ had huge ~~for~~ divisions. The ~~was~~ First World War resulted in large economic divisions due to the massive ~~de~~ unemployment, and this resulted to ~~huge~~ further political divisions, where the PSI were ~~gaining~~ ~~the majority of~~ ~~the~~ becoming noticed by peasants, who thought that liberalism was destroying their standard of living. Therefore, the rise of Socialism evidently shows the political and economic ~~all~~ divisions within ~~the~~ Italy between 1896-22, since liberalism was declining and Mussolini took advantage of ~~these~~ these political and economic divisions, which resulted in the decline of Socialism and liberalism and the rise in Fascism.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response is well-focussed on the issue of divisions within Italy, shows understanding of the key issues and selects appropriate supporting evidence. The response gives a range of explanations for the increase in divisions but does not have a sustained focus on the extent to which the divisions increased.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Level 4 and Level 5 responses are often characterised by clearly focused openings to paragraphs. In this response the opening sentence of each paragraph highlight the issue being discussed and creates a clear line of argument from the previous paragraph.

Question 6

Most candidates understood the importance of the Church's support in helping Mussolini to control a Roman Catholic Italy, but there was less understanding of the importance of the other traditional elites. The king was also often mentioned, but his role in ending Mussolini's dictatorship in 1943 was rarely developed. Sometimes candidates wrote about why the elites supported Mussolini rather than on the impact of their support on his ability to control Italy. Most candidates made their judgements on the basis of a comparison with other factors such as the use of propaganda and censorship, the role of terror and violence and the effectiveness of Mussolini's domestic and/or foreign policy; few responses developed the concept of apathy as an agent of control. Higher Level responses were able to discuss the relative importance of these different factors with detailed knowledge and understanding. A disappointing number of candidates, however, were unable to discuss aspects of control across the time period, for examples, only a few responses mentioned the decline in support from the Church as Mussolini's relationship with Germany strengthened, or the circumstances surrounding the end of the regime. Lower Level responses tended to compare the role of the Church and the elites with general comments on propaganda and violence using limited substantiated supporting material.

Question 7

Republicanism, Civil War and Francoism in Spain, 1931–75

This topic has become increasingly popular over the course of the qualification, and it was particularly pleasing to see that the fourth bullet point of the specification – centred on the rule of Franco – is now being covered so well by Centres. Examiners often commented that the candidates approached the responses to the topic in general with interest and enthusiasm.

This question allowed the candidates to explore their knowledge and understanding of experiences in Nationalist and Republican areas during the Civil War. Candidates were able to approach this question in several different but equally effective ways. As envisaged in the mark scheme, most candidates were able to use their knowledge from the specification of the relative strength of the Republicans and Nationalists at the outbreak of war, the course of the war, the use of terror and the reasons why the Nationalists won the civil war to produce a competent response about zones of occupation. There were many good responses, however, that could also refer to the Republican and Nationalist zones of occupation in some detail, using their understanding of the political geography of the war while deploying knowledge of Nationalist advantages in command, foreign aid and ruthlessness. Many candidates used their knowledge of the use of terror to great effect and the majority of candidates mentioned the Republican 'civil war within a civil war'. Most candidates were able to select and deploy appropriate knowledge to support their answers producing a range of L3-L5 responses. Level 3 responses tended to be more descriptive of the nature of control in the Republican and Nationalist zones while higher Level responses clearly provided a comparative analysis of the effective control established by each side.

This is a L3 response from the Spain 1931-75 topic.

Put a cross in the box indicating the SECOND question you have chosen to answer ☒.
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒
and then put a cross in another box ☒.

Chosen Question Number:

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

Plan:

International aid = Nationalists = Germany

Italy

Republicans = Russia, international volunteers

non-intervention treaty

Divisions in the left = volunteers

communists (Negrin)

social rev. = anarchists + socialists

Republicans = democracy

Barcelona

Madrid = last place to fall

Role of Franco + army.

(This page is for your second answer.)

During the civil war, it is argued that the Nationalists zones were ~~occupied~~^{controlled} more efficiently than the Republican zones. I believe that this is true because of the weakness of the Republicans. This is due to international aid, divisions in the left and the role of Franco and the army. The most significant factor ~~is~~^{was} the divisions in the left as there was no stability amongst the Republicans.

Firstly, it could be argued that international aid is why the Nationalist zones were more controlled. Within the civil war a non-intervention treaty was signed by European countries. This was mainly enforced by Britain and France but this was seen as a sign of weakness by the countries of Germany and Italy. Because of this they offered to support the Nationalists with equipment and troops. Italy sent 75,000 troops which would have allowed the Nationalists to control their occupied zones effectively due to the high number of troops. On the other hand, the Republicans did not receive as much aid. They obtained resources from Russia but were outdated. Additionally, they gained international volunteers who wanted to

(This page is for your second answer.)

The Republicans and Communists did not want whilst the Republicans wanted a democracy. As each political viewpoint wanted different things they began to argue amongst themselves meaning that it was difficult for them to maintain their occupied zones. As the left were constantly divided, it was easier for the Nationalists to control their zones and gain more land. This therefore supports the argument that the divisions in the left would allowed the Nationalists to control occupied areas, then allowing them to win.

The role of General Franco was also ^{an} important factor for how the Nationalists controlled occupied areas more effectively. Amongst the right were the Conservatives, Monarchists and Fascists. Within the Conservatives was the army. The army were strongly Nationalists and therefore ~~made~~ allowed them to have an advantage over the Republicans. The Republicans had weak forces such as the international volunteers. If the international volunteers were to fight against the army, they would lose. This would then mean that the Nationalists would be

(This page is for your second answer.)

able to ~~control~~ control occupied areas due to the strength of the army. Within the army was the Army of Africa, led by General Franco. At the start of the war, the Army of Africa was the size of 300,000 troops but due to the success of Franco, this then doubled to 600,000 by 1937. This shows how Franco was an important factor for the Nationalist success as he was able to gain more support for the Nationalists. Unlike the other leaders, such as Sanjurjo and Mola, Franco did not die and was therefore able to adopt the title of Generalissimo. This would increase his popularity as he was a strong military leader. Additionally, Franco was strongly anti-communist which was a popular viewpoint amongst the Nationalists. Franco would have used that to his advantage to allow the Nationalists to be more organised as they all shared the same view under one leader; therefore meaning that the Nationalists were more effective in ~~the~~ controlling occupied zones.

(This page is for your second answer.)

Overall, I believe that international aid and the role of Franco was important in showing the weaknesses of the Republicans and the strengths of the Nationalists but the divisions within the left was the most significant factor. This is due to the lack of organisation from the left which thrived in the right. By not agreeing on one aim would mean that they are in conflict with themselves causing them to lose the war and control of their ^{occupied} ~~seized~~ zones.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This response attempts analysis and shows some understanding of the question focus. The candidate has used their knowledge and understanding of the topic to select information relevant to, but not clearly focused on, the wording of the question asked. This has allowed the candidate to explain why the Nationalists were stronger than the Republicans but the response does not address issues of control.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always read the question carefully and consider the key words and phrasing of the question.

This is a L4 response to the Spain 1931-75 topic. It selects appropriate information from the specification, including international aid, the role of terror and leadership, to establish a well-focused response.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

? Red + White Terror

1. Foreign Aid

3. Leaders

(This page is for your second answer.) I agree to a great extent that the Nationalist zones were controlled more effectively during the Spanish Civil War, due to the impact of foreign aid, the use of terror and the leaders of the two opponents.

Firstly, foreign aid ~~was~~ made a huge impact on the effectiveness of Nationalist and Republican control, as it is far easier to control a population if their morale is high. The use of terror can easily result in ~~or~~ a violent retaliation, ~~and~~ as well as different leaders, but people are unlikely to protest if they are not suffering. In the Nationalist Zones, there were high quantities of food, but the whole area was placed under strict military rule, so as to help the war effort. Aid was supplied from countries, most importantly Italy and ~~&~~ Germany. Italy sent around 50,000 troops in the end, as well as thousands of weapons, tanks and planes. The German Condor Legion was legendary and ensured the Nationalists dominated the air for most of the Civil War. Therefore, the prosperity of the Nationalist zones made them easier to control. Meanwhile, in the Republican zones, the Soviet Union was supplying most of the equipment. These were extremely bad

(This page is for your second answer.) quality and cost two thirds of Spain's gold reserves, whilst Nationalist Aid was supplied ~~by~~ with generous loans. This led to a surge in Russian popularity whilst the arrival of International Brigades heightened morale immensely. However, 16% of the volunteers were killed, and ultimately the aid received by the Republicans was so expensively useless it drained its resources and there were severe shortages in the Republican zones. Therefore, foreign aid meant that the Nationalist zone could be controlled more effectively than the Republican zones.

The use of terror also impacted control. At the start of the war, Red Terror was rampant. Horror stories were spread of priests being murdered humiliateingly, or of nuns being raped, or middle class business owners being killed. However, soon the Republican leaders cracked down on this, and tribunals were set up to try offenders fairly. Meanwhile, in the Nationalist zones, atrocities were being purposefully committed to civilians to assert control. Men, women and children were penalised for things such as reading a socialist newspaper before the war, or being related to someone in the Republican

(This page is for your second answer.) army. The mass killings of essentially innocent civilians meant that a climate of fear existed in the Nationalist zones, and very few people dared speak out against their rulers. In places like Bilbao and Guernica, the use of widespread civilian bombings meant that resistance was destroyed before the Nationalists even entered the towns. This is less important than foreign intervention, as it can be argued it was this that helped create White Terror in the first place, but led to a greater degree of control as the leaders of each zone, as it is possible to rise up against any leader if they act alone.

~~Therefore~~ It was the leaders of the Nationalist side that implemented the White Terror, but ~~that~~ this does not make them more important as zeal is needed for the terror to be effective, which cannot be credited only to leaders. In the Nationalist zones, Franco had succeeded in uniting many opposing factions on the right, such as the Carlists and the Falangists. This unity meant that there was no opportunity for the any resisting groups to fight against a divided group; the Nationalists were constantly united against

(This page is for your second answer.) the Republicans. They, meanwhile could only maintain unity for a portion of the war. Disjointed, they fell to infighting. The Republicans were made up of socialists, communists, trotskyites and others. Although foreign aid was more important than the skill of the leaders because it impacted the war positively, the disunity was a hindrance to this too, as Stalin refused to send aid to the POUM, who were seen as traitors by the Communists. And whilst the Nationalists were conquering Spain, many Republican leaders fled the country to avoid death, leaving the army in disarray and so leadership. Remaining behind, Negrin attempted to negotiate with Franco, creating a 13-point manifesto. This failed, and showed the ~~the~~ Republican leaders' weakness, as Franco refused to negotiate and continued to win the war. When the socialists and the communists began to fight in the streets of Madrid, all Franco had to do was wait for them to finish and conquer the capital. Therefore, the leaders of the zones meant that the Nationalist zones could be controlled more effectively, as the Republicans allowed disunity and infighting to ruin their chances at victory.

(This page is for your second answer.) In conclusion, I believe that the Nationalist zones were controlled more effectively during the civil war due to foreign aid, which boosted morale and supplied the people, the use of terror, which silenced them, and the leaders, whose unity did not allow any resistance to succeed.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This is a Level 4 response. It is a well-focussed analysis with an understanding of key issues and uses appropriately selected supporting evidence.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Always use the wording of the question to focus the response more clearly. This response refers to elements of control more effectively than the L3 response for Q7 included in the report.

This is a L4 response that considers more directly the actions of Republicans and Nationalists in occupied zones. It tends to explain elements of control rather than provide explicit analysis and has some less secure supporting evidence.

Put a cross in the box indicating the **SECOND** question you have chosen to answer .
Your second question choice must be on a different topic to your first question choice.
If you change your mind, put a line through the box
and then put a cross in another box .

Chosen Question Number:

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

(This page is for your second answer.)

^{Plan.}
- Nat. zones → farming - Rep. zones → lack of food, but fair society.
- Terror

The two zones during the Spanish Civil War were in stark contrast due to the political differences of the two. In the Republican zone, society was controlled by left-wing ideology, whereas the Nationalists had right-wing views. The possession of farming zones was also influential, as was the use of terror against political opponents.

The Nationalists were able to effectively control their zone due to their retention of farming areas. One such region was in Extremadura, one of the largest farming areas in Spain. This meant that the Nationalist leaders were not in danger of a social revolution, because citizens were well fed. As well as Extremadura, the Nationalists controlled the Canary Islands, which ~~was~~ was home to most of Spain's tobacco farms. This was important, as smoking had become very popular in Spain in the 1930s, so the plentiful supply of cigarettes

(This page is for your second answer.)

would have satisfied civilians in the Nationalist zone. Moreover, the Nationalists boosted morale through religious and military pageantry, which also demonstrated how strong the army was. By displaying a strong army morale was raised, but it also helped control the people.

Contrastingly, in the Republican zone, hierarchy was almost entirely abolished, as people were forbidden from addressing others as ~~senior~~ 'señor' (sir). While this adhered to left-wing ideology, it showed the lack of a command structure that had hindered the Republicans' military organisation. However, the Republicans did control their zone's economy, particularly in the anarchist hub of Barcelona. There, 70% of businesses were collectivised, which gave the workers power to control the company that they worked for. This made them hard to control though, especially as the anarchists rejected all forms of government. A further difference to the Nationalist zone was food shortages. Because the Republicans didn't hold major farming zones, people had to wait in long queues for a small amount of food. This made the Republican zone harder to control, because people were agitated by the lack of food, which destabilised the Republican government.

Terror was a crucial factor in controlling the zones during the Spanish Civil War, but both sides administered it differently. In the Republican zone there was a frenzy of killings up until the start of 1937, when the government

(This page is for your second answer.)

had regained control and outlawed the killing of Nationalist opponents, still the death toll may have been as high as 50,000 before the Republican government regained control. This displayed the divisions in Republican Spain, as the Communists and Anarchists wanted an immediate revolution, whereas moderate Republicans wanted a stable government. The government could not effectively control such drastically different factions. On the other hand, Nationalist terror against political opponents was officially sanctioned by Franco, resulting in up to 200,000 deaths. This aggressive policy emphasises how the Nationalists were willing to control opposition in their zone, at any cost. In some ways, this was excessive, as some civilians were executed simply for being related to a Republican supporter. In that sense, the ~~Republican~~ Nationalists' terror went beyond regaining control.

Overall, the evidence overwhelmingly supports the statement that the Nationalist zones were controlled more effectively than the Republican zones. The Nationalists were able to do this by keeping morale high, through the ample provision of food and through religious and military pageantry. This contrasted the Republican zone where morale was low due to food shortages. In addition, terror was brutally implemented to control the Nationalist zone, while in the Republican zone, disagreements over terror emphasised the lack of control. The ~~the~~ repressive Nationalist regime was able to control their

(This page is for your second answer.)

zone by ~~devised~~ eliminating opponents and simultaneously maintaining the morale of its supporters.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The response is well-focused with an understanding of the key issues. It deploys relevant and appropriate supporting evidence but is not always wholly convincing.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

Take time to think about the response to an answer. Questions will always be different from those practised in class and for revision. Use the knowledge and understanding that you have to answer the exact question asked on the exam paper. This response has focused on the areas occupied by the Republicans and Nationalism to try to establish the extent and nature of control.

Question 8

This was the more popular of the two questions and produced some responses of a particularly high standard. Many examiners commented on the level of knowledge and understanding seen in many responses and often commented that this question produced the most engaging and interesting answers. One comment received in preparation for this report stated that 'candidates seemed to enjoy this question'. The majority of candidates answering E8 were able to deal effectively with the suggestion that Franco was able to adapt his policies to changing situations and were well prepared to discuss the concept of Franco's pragmatism. There was a good deal of confidence in using both economic and cultural evidence for adaptation, and there was some excellent exposition on the use of terror. Some evidence tended towards the descriptive and not all candidates were able to sustain their argument across the time period. Higher Level responses were often those which addressed changing policies across the period, usually in relation to World War II, the end of the 1950s and the problematic years of the 1970s, along with other factors such as repression. There were a significant number of high L4-L5 responses.

Question 9

Germany Divided and Reunited, 1945–91

This topic is studied by a small number of Centres and the candidates are generally well prepared. Candidates have good knowledge of the events but this is often undermined by a lack of secure chronological awareness; discussion of events in the 1980s often refer to the introduction of *Ostpolitik* and candidates often confuse Ulbricht and Honecker.

Most candidates clearly understood the need to analyse US support in relation to the economic differences between East and West Germany. However, knowledge of the impact of US support was often disappointing and the role of the US was asserted rather than explained and/or analysed. Many candidates were able to distinguish between developments in East and West Germany and make a case for the impact of the USSR and Marxist-Leninism in the GDR as opposed to capitalism, the free market, etc in the US supported FRG. There were also some higher Level responses which argued for the relative importance of internal factors including the policies of Adenauer/Erhardt/Ulbricht and the natural resources available to each state. Lower Level responses were often characterised by insecure chronological knowledge.

Question 10

This was the more popular of the two questions. Many candidates seemed comfortable with this question, being well prepared for a question relating to the downfall of communism in East Germany. Most candidates were able to focus on the question/given factor and link it to other factors particularly Gorbachev, Honecker, protest in Poland and the end to the Brezhnev Doctrine. However, this was a 'significance' question rather than a multi-factor question and required candidates to address clearly the role of internal opposition in relation to other factors and/or the wider context. Although most candidates did have a good grasp of the role played by internal opposition, the number of candidates who were able to develop their supporting evidence in any detail was somewhat disappointing. Knowledge of events in Leipzig and their impact was usually well developed but there was often limited reference to New Forum, the role of the Church, dissatisfaction with the SED and other forms of protest. Many candidates also showed a less than secure chronological knowledge of the fall of communism. The best answers considered the contextual development of opposition in relation to other factors.

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

This is an ever popular topic and the candidates are generally well prepared considering the complex nature of the events being studied. As with some of the other topics mentioned above, it has been a pleasure to see greater coverage of the whole time period as the course has progressed, and, in particular, the way in which Centres have adapted to teaching the development of Arab Nationalism. Candidates are clearly making a definite choice to answer questions in relation to Arab Nationalism and some of the best responses are of a very high quality indeed. There is, though, still the perennial problem of a lack of secure chronological knowledge in many of the answers.

Question 11

Most candidates were able to discuss the deterioration in relations between Jews and Arabs in Palestine in the years between the end of World War II and the outbreak of the first Arab-Israeli conflict. Responses at L3 tended to produce a narrative of events or an insecure discussion of the long-term reasons for the decline in relations while L4 answers analysed more clearly the reasons for the deterioration. Higher Level responses required an analysis of the reasons for the 'rapid' deterioration in these years. Some candidates produced imbalanced responses by referring in too much detail to the long term causes of conflict in Palestine. A few responses extended the time period into the 1970s and so produced a large amount of irrelevant material. The best responses were able to pinpoint specific events or turning-points within the time period – such as the British decision to withdraw or the UN partition plan - which exacerbated existing longer term causes.

Question 12

This was a 'significance' question rather than a multi-factor question and so a discussion focussed on the role of Nasser in relation to other factors and/or the wider context was essential. Differentiation within this question, therefore, depended on the extent of candidate knowledge with regard to the impact of Nasser's character and policies in relation to the development of Arab nationalism. Most candidates generally had a good knowledge of Nasser's impact but many responses produced a narrative commentary rather than clear analysis. Most responses compared Nasser's impact in relation to other significant influences. In the best responses there was a clear appreciation of the importance of Palestinian liberation across the Arab world, and a few showed awareness that Arab nationalism declined in importance after Nasser's death and Sadat's agreement to accept US aid and promote a more tolerant view of Israel. A very small number were able to point to the rise of new forms of Arab nationalism from the mid-1960s which challenged the secular pan-Arab nationalism championed by Nasser.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Firstly, coverage of all four bullet points is vital. It was particularly clear this year that full coverage of the bullet points allows for candidates access to the full range of questions available for them to choose from and also results in many interesting and thought-provoking responses.
- Secondly, candidates should be encouraged to take time at the beginning of the examination to acquaint themselves with what the question is asking them to focus on, and especially of the timescale in the question.
- Finally, to make it clear to candidates that the questions set cannot be one's they have specifically seen before. They should be prepared to select and deploy their knowledge and understanding for the question set not the question they hope for and, indeed, they should always be prepared for the unexpected.

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>

Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government



Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.